# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his most recent book, *Down Peacock's Feathers*, the Rev. D. R. DAVIES comes up against the problem of divine omnipotence. The book is an exposition of the General Confession in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, and the first question that presents itself is in the opening words: 'Almighty and most merciful Father.' Almighty: what does this mean? In what sense is God omnipotent? It is this problem that causes so much uneasiness to the enquiring mind in a time of war.

There are two points in Mr. DAVIES' discussion that are worth mention. They are both suggested by other writers. Dr. Forsyth (whom Mr. DAVIES calls one of the greatest theologians of the twentieth century) said that most of the so-called problems of theology were due to the fact that they represented secular ideas which had not undergone the process of baptism into Christ. That is, they originated from a purely human viewpoint and were incorporated into Christian theology without being reshaped in terms of Christian experience.

Omnipotence is one of these ideas. It is generally thought of as power to impose will, power to remove resistance by force. Has God the power to impose His will upon unwilling objects? Put in this way, the question suggests human pride masquerading in the guise of theology. For in all human history the test of the reality of power has been the ability to impose one's own will. That is the pagan conception of omnipotence, and it has been revived in both Nazism and Marxism—in the one case the will of the Führer, in the other the will of the proletariat. It is ability to crush opposition. The same thing is true in social life, in the family, as an instance. In ancient times the power of the father was absolute, and it has taken centuries of struggle to achieve personal status for women and children within the family.

Now it is here that the basic error in thinking about omnipotence is found. If God's omnipotence were thought of in this pagan way we could not well escape the celebrated dilemma: Either God is omnipotent and not good, because He allows evil; or He is good but not omnipotent, which is a short cut to atheism, for a god that is powerless is no god at all. But the very existence of evil in the world is a proof that God is not omnipotent in this pagan sense. He does not deal with opposition by crushing it. We have therefore to baptize the idea of power into Christ, for the source of difficulty about God's omnipotence is that we have taken the secular idea of power without reshaping it in terms of the New Testament teaching.

Well, that is the first suggestive point in Mr. DAVIES' exposition, and we all go along with it. The second is much more difficult to grasp, and not, perhaps, so enlightening. Its source this time is Kierkegaard. Naturally, when Mr. DAVIES purges the conception of omnipotence of pagan elements and says, 'It is not that,' we inevitably ask: 'Well, what *is* it?' Kierkegaard says that the whole question of God's goodness and omnipotence and its relation to evil 'can perhaps be explained quite simply in this way.' The greatest good that can be done to any being is to make it free. In order to be able to do this omnipotence is necessary.

'This will sound curious,' he says. 'But if we rightly consider omnipotence, then clearly it must have the quality of so taking itself back in the very manifestation of its all-powerfulness that the results of this act of the omnipotent can be independent. . . . God's omnipotence is therefore His goodness. For goodness means to give absolutely, yet in such a way that by gradually taking oneself back one makes the recipient independent. Omnipotence alone can make something independent.' This is what is inconceivable: omnipotence can not only bring forth the most imposing of all things, the world in its visible totality, but it can create the most delicate of all things, a creature independent of it.

Working from this idea of Kierkegaard's, Mr. DAVIES goes further. Kierkegaard said that God's omnipotence is His goodness. Mr. DAVIES says: 'To say that God is love is the same thing

as saying that God is almighty. Correctly understood, omnipotence is love in action.' Omnipotence and love are like the heads and tails of a penny. Together they constitute the unity of God's character. They can be understood in relation to each other. Separated from each other they become meaningless.

Mr. DAVIES insists that we start from the revelation in the Bible that God is love. And His love is first shown in His creation of man in His own image. 'And it is precisely in the endowment of man with freedom that God's omnipotence resides. Love is the power to grant freedom without desiring to limit or inhibit its exercise. . . . And it is only omnipotence that can refrain absolutely from trespassing upon freedom.' God suffers in Himself the entire consequence of allowing man absolute freedom. That is His love. It is also His omnipotence.

And here is a short paragraph in which Mr. DAVIES meets the problem of evil and omnipotence. 'Thus the existence of evil and suffering in the world is a proof, not that God is either good but powerless, or all-powerful but not good. On the contrary, it is the proof that God is both loving and omnipotent. For only absolute love could grant unhindered freedom, and only omnipotence can endure the operation of such freedom.'

---

A good book is not necessarily a big book. That trite remark is suggested by the Rev. R. A. EDWARDS' publication, *The Church and the Modern World*.[1] It extends barely to a hundred pages, yet it is one of the most stimulating and suggestive that we have read for some time. It is based on a course of lecture-sermons preached in Exeter Cathedral in Lent last year. We are glad that they are available to a wider public.

Mr. EDWARDS is of opinion that we are 'confronted with a major social revolution comparable with nothing that has happened since the Renaissance'; and that there is danger of the Church fiddling away this opportunity as it fiddled away that one.

He begins by asking how has it happened that the world regards the Church as something largely, if not entirely, irrelevant to its affairs? He answers by sketching in a few vigorous paragraphs what has happened since the passing of the Middle Ages. Gradually the Church receded in importance to an ever-contracting background, the world giving diminishing attention to what the Church had to say. One range of human interest and activity after another was 'secularized.'

This, of course, is familiar and obvious. Multitudes recently had little if any place for the Church. They were not interested enough in the Church to oppose or revile her. She was to them simply a matter of entire indifference.

Now, however, many are wondering wistfully if the Church has anything to say, any light to cast, any guidance to offer. The world crashed. Science failed to 'deliver the goods.' Secular education did not save the world from plunging into war after war. The view that men needed only wise teaching for Utopia to be born has proved a tragic misunderstanding and Machiavelli is triumphant in Hitler. The world faces moral bankruptcy. Has the Church anything to say? 'The world,' suggests Mr. EDWARDS, 'is more ready than it has been for centuries to listen.'

Next, is the Church saying anything to this bewildered, perplexed questioning world? Do the ecclesiastical trumpets utter any clear note about anything? Or are we still concerned only with our ancient shibboleths and domestic concerns?

The world, Mr. EDWARDS is sure, can be effectively answered only with the gospel of Christ, and his little but so pregnant book is a reconsideration of what that gospel is.

The Church must begin by inviting the world to consider its real state and insisting that this state has come about through lack of faith. At the Renaissance the world decided that belief in God did not matter, and by the end of the nineteenth century the intelligentsia were left with no beliefs at all and their scepticism infected other classes.

Time has proved that with scepticism or indifference values cannot be preserved. Ideas such as liberty, compassion, honesty are not secure in any right of their own. They ever derived from a view of the universe which based itself on the idea of God. Take the basis away and the superstructure totters.

The Church then must speak to the world about God, not a philosophical presupposition nor a scientific First Cause but the real God about whom Hebrew prophets spoke, the living God active as Personality in the everyday world. Unless that is accepted the Church has nothing further to say.

Suppose it is accepted, the Church must proceed

[1] Methuen; 3s. 6d. net.

to do justice to Christ. We need not only a particular view of God but a very particular view of Christ. He is not one saint and martyr and prophet among others. He is unique.

He is God incarnate. That belief must be proclaimed uncompromisingly. Otherwise, what special compelling sanction accompanies the preaching of the ethic of Jesus? A non-theological gospel is a futility. Anything the Church may have to say, for example, on economics depends ultimately on what it has to say about Christ. The rules of God's Kingdom are plain in the New Testament but the world cannot make use of them apart from the initial step of 'accepting Christ as God,' and living in communion with Christ. Dogma, of course, may be overstressed, it sometimes has been, but for the successful prosecution of the Church's work there is no escape from dogma; without it the Church has nothing to say.

Then a particular view of human beings must be presented—a realist view not the humanistic ideal. The Church cannot speak to men as if they were all Christian at heart. When the world invites her to assist in planning a better world she must 'say stern things about sin.' That involves that the Church's message is primarily about individuals. The individual needs 'salvation' if anything very satisfactory is to be done about the world.

We wish we could go on following Mr. EDWARDS as he expatiates on 'the social message' but our space forbids. We hope what has been said will urge many to read and ponder and pass on a very valuable little book.

---

It looks as though in America the question of the post-war world order is beginning to be discussed as seriously as in certain quarters in this country. One evidence of this is to hand in a recently published composite work, entitled *A Basis for the Peace to Come*.[1]

In this work six distinguished public men, animated by the common belief that a just and durable peace should be planned before and not after the war ends, try to face the political, economic, and religious problems that will be forced upon us by the post-war situation. Bishop Francis J. McConnell contributes the first essay, and he is followed by John Foster Dulles, William Paton, Leo Pasvolsky, Hu Shih, and Carl J. Hambro. The essays retain their original form of Lectures given at the Ohio Wesleyan University.

Perhaps the first essay, 'The Church Must Face It,' is the most relevant to these columns. The Bishop indicates some results at the close of the war of which we can be tolerably certain. They will all provide occasions for the putting forth of Christian effort.

To begin with, the world will be poor. If in the long run the problem of poverty and hunger may settle itself, in the short run the standard of living will drop, indeed will not remain far above what we have regarded as the lower limit of civilization.

Another feature will be unemployment. Suppose the Axis powers are defeated, some sort of industrial organization will have to be maintained in the conquered territories. The problem must not be solved, as Germany solved it after the World War, by the nations turning to the manufacture of munitions. As for the problem among ourselves, we must seek to obviate the summary throwing of millions of men out of work.

Again, we must recognize the certainty that after the war there will be a revival of materialism. Not so much the materialism of too much matter, in which there is lavish expenditure and waste, as the materialism of too little matter, in which we put the greater emphasis on material goods the fewer of them we possess. An atmosphere must be created and conserved in which the high human values get their chance. Yet this is not to be brought about by denying that wealth is an instrument for the attainment of the higher goods.

Yet again, we shall have to meet and cope with after the war a decline in morality. An extraordinary burst of moral energy is followed by moral exhaustion. No doubt human beings have unexpected reserves upon which they can draw in moments of crisis, but reserves once exhausted are gone, to be replenished only after long effort. Here the approach of the Church should be with sympathy and understanding. It is hard for anybody to keep his soul in days of overstrain.

The general message of the Church in the face of all such particular problems may well be stated in the Kantian maxim that an individual is not to be regarded as a tool or instrument but as an end-in-himself. This in fact is one of the principles for which we are fighting. (And yet

[1] Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.00.

America has as yet failed to apply it to the solution of the negro problem.)

In his analysis of the task of the Church in relation to the achievement of world order Dr. William Paton, another of the contributors, emphasizes the point that the Church possesses and should be able to express the power of new life and creation of life out of death. He fully recognizes the importance of political and economic planning. But neither political nor economic planning and reconstruction touches the heart of the problem we have to face. Faith, hope, and love are needed to counteract disillusionment and despair.

He concludes, and his words may serve to round off the Bishop's call to the Church : 'There is nowhere in the world a doctrine or a power or a life which is relevant to this task of bringing love out of hate and life out of death except the spirit of Jesus.' And again, 'I can conceive no greater task for the Church than that it should be, in a world seeking for life, the vehicle and witness and repository of the life of Christ which is forgiveness, release, and power.'

# Reconstruction Problems.

## XV. Restoration and Restitution.

By the Reverend W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., Woodstock, Oxford.

'War,' it is often said, 'settles nothing.' Whether that is true or false, every war that is more than a mere brutal conflict of lust and greed is a cry for settlement. War is, in fact, a confession that for the time being no other means of settlement is practicable. When reason shakes her head—'I can do no more'—the sword cries, 'Let me try,' and makes a mess of it, of course; but, in the end, reason finds her opportunity again, and some settlement is made. And since the fate of Carthage in the third century B.C. that settlement has seldom been a mere *vae victis*. In modern times, the gigantic Napoleonic struggle, the Indian Mutiny, the American Civil War, the Boer War, and the War that ended with Versailles, all produced settlements that were intended to embody something permanent. 'Woe to the vanquished' was in the mind of the conquerors of 1871; but never did the conquered rise again more swiftly. The losers will always think the terms harsh; the winners will always claim that they are lenient. If they had contained better provision for future revision, most of them might have been more lasting than they were. Peace, like health, is normal; war, whether as a surgical operation or a violent purge, is never without grim peril.

Again, a peace settlement is often hailed as the beginning of a new era. But only at Versailles was this taken seriously. The world has owed much to Versailles. It is only our complaisant acceptance of the German verdict that has led us to 'crab' it so constantly. But we had not then got beyond the lower forms in the school of reconstruction. 'Let us set the smaller nations on their feet; we can then leave them to themselves.' That was first the attitude of the U.S.A.; then of England. The result—new national armies, and frowning tariff walls; the flouting of the League of Nations, and—Hitler. What we did not recognize was that every nation will follow its idea of its own interests, however often that idea changes, to gain its own ends; what we therefore did not plan was so to arrange conditions of life that this is felt to be only worth while through peaceful methods, and along with other nations, rather than against them.

In 1918 we said, 'every historical problem is coming up for solution.' To-day, where there were a dozen, there are now a hundred, economic, moral, social, industrial, religious. What nation is without them? 'We must begin planning now,' say some. 'No; we must get on with the war.' We must; but we shall do it all the better for laying the foundations of peace. The more steadily we look forward, the more clearly do we see two main problems, restoration and restitution. The first, if mainly, to many of us, for our own country, involves all others. The second will make to many a less cogent appeal. But Germany's victims will force it on us.

Projects of restoration and renewal are many. The Pope, the Archbishops and Free Church leaders, the Atlantic Charter, the British Council of the Churches, and now the Beveridge Report, with its watchwords of correlation, comprehension, and co-operation; 'a scheme of social insurance against the interruption and destruction of earning power and for special expenditure arising at birth,

marriage or death.'[1] We are familiar with campaigns for education, pensions, housing, and the like, and the party conflicts that they have roused. Now the appeal is made to the whole nation. A magnificent vision of a Britain where every house shall be a home; where every child shall have its chance; and where the dark shadow of unemployment no longer chills the air. But it is only workable if we remember that no nation can prosper when its neighbours are helpless. Germany has started on the rake's progress of turning her victims into helots; 'hewers of wood and drawers of water, while we produce the goods which all mankind must look for from us.' The walls of the house built on the sand are already beginning to crack. But even without that dreadful example, we are at one with the *Report*. Nor can we leave Europe to her misery. Its needs must be the first charge on our effort at recovery.

The more closely we contemplate our post-war tasks, the more bewildering do they become. Have we the men, the machinery, the morale? The answer to this question is not perhaps specially appropriate to the pages of this magazine; but there is a closely connected question which we cannot put aside. What does the Church mean to do about it? What is it bound to attempt? Before this, however; what is meant by 'the Church'? The word is distressingly ambiguous; few make up their minds in what sense they use it; their hearers or readers are still less certain; hence, it is not surprising that all exhortations fail, and only by accident does 'the Church' do anything. The meanings range from the blessed company of the faithful in heaven and earth to a particular denomination, Anglicans or Strict Baptists; from the Pope at Rome to the religious communities in a town, or only one of them; from a Papal encyclical to some Lambeth resolutions or a vague body of teaching like 'Doctrine in the Church of England,' or the 'findings' of Malvern or Tambaram, or even an address by a popular speaker on a religious subject.[2] Doubtless these will not be without their influence; but for the general public it will be no more than that of the statement of a group of politicians or economists.

Little help is to be gained from the New Testament, where the term is used for a local community, or the aggregate of them—often, by St. Paul at least, idealized as the body of Christ, 'the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Both are inapplicable now; for as well as parties, like those at Corinth, we have everywhere denominations, unknown in the first century, and the universal Church is now so widespread and heterogeneous that its only conceivable 'voice' would be that of a carefully selected and relatively minute body of representatives, as at Madras, of which the 'Church' as a whole is entirely ignorant. If then we ask, 'What about the Church? What is the Church going to say or do?', which meaning shall we select? We need not reject off-hand the more general one; a body of religious leaders called together to make a *pronunciamento*. It will presumably pray to be animated by the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, and the Christian believer will be unwilling to doubt the possibility of an answer to such a prayer. But the statement will be jostled and perhaps pushed aside by a score of others claiming no such high authority.

We may also understand by our 'church' a local community, organized for worship, instruction, and Christian activity, with a recognized minister or leaders, in touch with the pulsating life of the wider Church and sharing (however unconsciously) in experience, faith, rites, and the energizing work of the Paraclete. This is as near as we can get to the New Testament conception, and to anything to which a definite appeal can be made for influence on public affairs. It is indeed true that in the majority of our churches to-day a strong church consciousness is sadly lacking. In New Testament times the fellowship, the sense of comradeship, of sharing, was the very life of the Christian; to-day the Church is but one of his interests, even if it is for the most part free from the scandals familiar at Corinth, or the fierce disputes that tore at the churches in Galatia.

But there is another difference, of special importance for our present subject. The membership of such a church as this will touch the life of the whole community at a large number of points. It may well include merchants, lawyers, doctors, teachers, public servants, working men, and persons of both sexes who are quite capable of taking a leading part in the circle of their private friendships. The minister's influence will extend to few outside his own congregation; his members can influence every level in the community. This influence is probably not regarded by others as distinctively Christian. It is personal. But the fact remains that if the members of a typical church chose to exert their influence, there would be very few in the whole of their society who would not be affected by it. A convinced and resolute Christian, in any community, will do far more than 'pull his weight.'

What form and direction will this influence take? The political and social loyalties of the

[1] *Report on Social Insurance*, by Sir William Beveridge, Nov. 1942 (H.M. Stat. Office).

[2] Often 'the Church' means Romans and Anglicans, but not Nonconformists. Where does the Presbyterian kirk come in?

members may differ considerably. But this is all to the good. For there is one point on which they will not differ. Every Christian knows that he must love his neighbour as he loves himself; that what he wants for himself he must and will want for his neighbour; that he will think of his neighbour's interest as his own; and that in honour he will prefer his neighbour to himself.[1] Now this is precisely what we have seen as underlying the whole scheme of restoration before us. The number and complexity of the problems is greater than any community of men or of nations has ever had to face. But the solutions turn on certain cardinal principles. These can be put even more tersely: the needs of all must be the concern of each; and the needs of each must be the concern of all. At bottom, it is not a question of intellect, but of morals, of attitude. If the right attitude is wanting, there is no hope for the future. If this is supplied, we shall find that the resources of the intellect are not exhausted. But whence are we to look for this attitude? From the Christian Church, in the sense of organized bodies of Christian believers. It is essential to Christianity; it is universal in Christianity. It has the highest of sanctions. No 'enthusiasm of humanity,' whether altruistic or utilitarian, could be expected to stand the strain; it is the direct result of acknowledging the sovereignty, the kingdom, of God. God is behind it; it must, it can, be carried out. Thus, the Church is at the strategic centre; it is the power house.

But it is more. It is not indeed for a church as such to decide on the details of administration, either in the composition and functions of government departments or of frontiers, tariffs, international agreements, armaments. It would be just as inappropriate, in a labour dispute, for a church to lay down the precise wages per hour in a trade or the exact conditions of labour in a factory. But once we consider the Church as animated by loyalty to this principle and insisting on its observance and fulfilment, its application immediately enters the realm of the possible. How this is done is already clear. In this country at any rate the functions of the community are to an increasing extent performed along three lines of activity; the State, local bodies, and individuals, many of whom are voluntary and unpaid. This is true in both national and local spheres; in the world of education, of public assistance, insurance, health, and so on.

In each of these, Christians are or ought to be at home; they should make themselves at home. The Church should be a reservoir from which such high-minded servants of the community can be drawn. This is already being done to some extent in all branches of public life.[2] Christians are the salt of the earth. The new problems that must be solved create a new and grave demand on the Church; but it can be supplied; and the Church, thus understood, exists to supply it. And if its true nature and its urgency are realized, we need have little fear for the future. In the new opportunities, called into being by the present crisis, we shall hear the voice of the Lord, bidding us go forward on the road He is building up, till the waste places of former desolations are restored and the desert blossoms as the rose.

Hitherto we have looked at the picture mainly from the angle of our own country's needs. But neither this nor any other country can be considered in isolation. To-day, however, countries cannot be treated alike. One of them has outraged the political sense as well as the moral convictions of humanity, has openly proclaimed principles that degrade all social life to the level of the jungle, and has put its principles into practice with such monstrous ruthlessness and barbarity that pillage, slavery, and torture have been the rule in all its conquests. Multitudes of helpless captives have been torn from their homes; whole populations have been subjected to a process of gradual but pitiless extermination. What may happen if the seething hatred produced by such a devil's brew boils over, it is impossible to conjecture. The yell for revenge, however natural, will be deprecated by all Christian sentiment. The demand for punishment will be very difficult for the tenderest pacifist to refuse. The plea for forgiveness and kindly feelings, until there is distinct and unmistakable evidence of a radical change of heart and mind, is wholly out of place.

What can and must be enforced, with a relentlessness as determined, though not as savage—that would be impossible—as its own, is restitution. Some will doubtless complain that this

[1] Mk $12^{33}$, Ro $12^{10}$, Ph $2^{4}$. There are other equally fundamental convictions; that the Christian is redeemed from sin and raised into a new world of values; that to faith all things are possible; that wealth is always a peril; and that life must be estimated in terms not of possession but of activity. But the Christian principle of the 'good neighbour' is what chiefly concerns us here, and indeed brings the rest with it.

[2] This supplies the answer to the silly plea that Christians should keep to their own sphere. 'What does the Christian know about commerce and economics?' Why should he not know as much as his critics, and more? An Archbishop may know quite as much even about banking as a journalist; and it must be remembered that in the references made by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the national function of the banks in his Albert Hall speech, he made no detailed proposals, but simply maintained that ultimate control of profits by the community must be applied to banking as well as to other departments of industry and commerce.

means harshness unworthy of a Christian, and call for protests from the authorities of the 'Church.' 'We must love our enemies.' But love is a sentiment, and therefore it has nothing to do with nations; only with individuals. Englishmen and Germans may love each other, however they understand the word. To talk of England loving Germany or Germany England is unmeaning. Moreover, when we think of Germany, we must not think of a nation which has so far been prevented, mercifully, from inflicting mortal injury on ourselves; but of one which has carried out on its miserable victims an organized and cold-blooded savagery to which the horrors of Attila and Timour were the play of children.

It is they who must be considered; to them that Germany must be held responsible for restitution. Neither they nor we could make the punishment 'fit the crime.' No punishment ever devised could 'fit' such a crime as theirs. Nor can we do to them as we would be done by were we in their place; for we cannot imagine ourselves or any other nation in such a place as theirs. The Bible, the New Testament as well as the Old, contains pictures of iniquity and oppression and visions of stern and unwavering judgment; it speaks, not only of the fate of the wild beast and his prophet, but of the exaction of the last farthing and of the fate deserved by one who would so much as cause a single little child to trip. But we have witnessed an evil that far outruns the foul plans of a Nero or a Domitian, and the horror-stricken imagination of the Apocalyptist. In such a situation, to which all history shows no precedent, there is only one act to be enforced: restitution. We cannot attempt to punish, however stern the sentences of death on criminals fifty times worse than common murderers. God only can punish. 'Vengeance is for me to inflict.' But we can see to it that what the wolf has devoured he disgorges; that what has been stolen with a high hand is restored; and that what has been destroyed in wanton rage is built up.

Even this indeed is possible only in part. Who can restore the venerable universities of Poland, the gay towns of Serbia, the smiling villages of Greece? Who can bring back to life the millions of old men, women, and little children, who on a dozen pretexts or no pretexts at all have been slaughtered in cold blood? In sight and sound of all this innocent blood, crying like that of Abel from the ground, one thing is imperatively necessary. We must concentrate on what Germany and her guilty allies must be made to do; not on what we can make them suffer. In the sight of men, they can only expiate their crimes by replanting the obscene wastes they have made, rebuilding the cities they have laid low, beating their swords into ploughshares, and labouring for their neighbours as they have forced their neighbours to labour for them.

It is not for us to judge them. It is not their intent that concerns us, but their deed. We shall not say to them, 'take this, and this.' We shall banish from our minds all the hot fumes of revenge. We shall also put an immediate end to any attempt by the criminals to 'organize sympathy.' But we shall not allow the flames of indignation to die down, or to regard as a light thing the abominations with which Germany has besmirched the whole of our humanity, or the blasphemy to God that could devise and execute them.[1] We must keep alive the passionate determination that this evil thing shall be destroyed for ever, as in a lake of fire. But we must do this at the very moment that we are devising the restitution that the Germans and their satellites are to make, and the conditions under which they themselves may receive any of the assistance that they denied to all. This is a debt that we owe to their victims, to ourselves, to the neutrals even, and to the very soul of Germany. For how could Germany otherwise ever attain her true place in the commonwealth of the nations of the world? And what is 'love' to Germany save the desire that she should eventually attain it? She can do so only if she learns that the law she has chosen to obey is the commandment of hell. So at last she may bring forth works meet for repentance, find pardon, and even stand, like Browning's Lost Leader, the next to the throne.

No church as such is fitted to offer solutions to the stupendous international problems of to-morrow. But the Christian has as good a claim to take a leading part in that work as any other citizen. Through all that the Church has given him or enabled him to receive, the Christian ought to be able to out-think the rest. But the Church, too, as a community or a widening circle of communities, must make itself heard. This can be done. Every community, if it has enough devotion and persistence, will find ways of commanding an audience. And no other message is as important as this. For the Church alone can harmonize and lift up before the eyes of men the attitudes—to most, irreconcilable and contradictory—which have just been described, and which must be maintained if all is not to be lost; the insistence that they who took shall restore, and they who destroyed shall rebuild; indignation at the calculated atrocities from which others,

[1] See, for instance, *Religious Persecution*, Report No. 3 of the Inter-allied Information Committee, June 1942 (H.M. Stat. Office); also *Day of Prayer for Poland*, Dec. 1942 (Polish Publication Committee, Birkenhead).

though not we ourselves, have suffered; and the longing for restoration, at whatever cost to them or to ourselves, even if some of the members of the Church, with the very spirit of Christ in them, should be led to forms of redemptive toil like that of Isaiah's 'servant of the Lord.'

This is the work of the Church; of every community of men held together by faith in Christ. In these days, when throughout the whole of Europe the Church has been silenced—there are exceptions; how honourable; but how few—or broken on the rack, the responsibility rests on organized Christianity in this country, and, we must add, in the U.S.A. It must be done; and there is no one else to do it. And because such a Church knows that God is alive, and that every good gift comes down from the Father of Lights, it will know itself as set to prepare the way of the Lord, that His saving health may be known among all nations.

# Literature.

## *THEOLOGICAL PREFACE.*

President John A. Mackay, D.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary, has written a book which has won much attention in the United States and now appears in a British reprint: *A Preface to Christian Theology* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). As we learn from Professor John Baillie's felicitous Introduction, Dr. Mackay was brought up in the Scottish Highlands, graduated at the University of Aberdeen with distinction in Philosophy, became a Professor of Philosophy and a Christian missionary in Lima, Peru, and for the last six or seven years has occupied his present post. At Princeton he stands in the succession of great Calvinistic theologians like Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield; and it is an authentic Princeton touch in this volume where a theology is desiderated which would take adequate account of the human situation and all human knowledge, and undertake for our time the task which was undertaken for their own times by Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and John Calvin.

But is not this the task which Karl Barth has set himself to fulfil? And does not Dr. Mackay appear to be well satisfied on the whole with the Barthian standpoint in theology? His volume betrays the influence of writers much canvassed in contemporary religious thought, such as Unamuno and Nietzsche, Berdyaev, Maritain and Gilson, John Macmurray, but the basic influence upon his theological standpoint appears to be that transcendental theology of divine revelation which is advocated by Barth and Brunner and has resort for its philosophical justification to Sören Kierkegaard, whom Dr. Mackay describes as 'the representative thinker of our time.'

But I must not give the impression that this is a book for the technical theologian. It is a book which the technical theologian will read with interest and appreciation, though he would want the author to elucidate certain points; but it is written so simply and attractively that one is not surprised to learn of the large measure of approval and success it has already gained. Hodge and Warfield would have looked with hesitant wonder upon a theological preface set, as this is, in a framework of symbol and metaphor and illuminated by many a striking instance; perhaps, however, only such a theological preface is calculated to arrest attention at the present juncture, when—in the symbol of which Dr. Mackay makes so much use—we are walking on 'the Emmaus road' in doubt and perplexity.

After analysing the present situation, Dr. Mackay distinguishes between the rational and the 'existential' approach to theology (the Balcony and the Road), contending for the latter as the only fruitful way. The professor should be also an apostle; only he that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine. Then in a chapter genuinely transcriptive of religious experience, the wayfarer is followed on the Road of his quest, till at length he encounters the personal Truth in Christ. This transforming encounter is then focussed within the framework of God's unfolding purpose, that Divine Drama which is the Christian interpretation of history. The discussion thereafter becomes less academic in substance (it is never really so in form) as, in keeping with the needs of the times, the author hastens to ethical considerations, both individual and social in bearing; first, the special quality of personal life arising from the real encounter with Christ; secondly, the particular form of corporate living similarly arising from such encounter. Here the discussion runs swiftly and smoothly, as though the author were on well-tried and favourite ground. It is also lit up by devotional beauty and sustained by practical fervour. If the topical applications of Christian ethical principle are not now unfamiliar, it should be recalled that since the book was first written there have been many other writings on current ideologies and policies.

Obviously Dr. Mackay aligns himself with the central trends of a modern conservative Christian theology. It would be well if a theologian of his intellectual ability, wide-ranging interests, and spiritual insight would advance beyond a 'Preface'; it might even be found that he would repudiate the Barthian exclusivism and irrationalism. Yet I am half inclined to fear the worst! However, there is hopefulness in the concession that Barth, following Kierkegaard, may sound harsh and

extreme notes in his 'grand chorale' of the divine transcendence.

(Probably the author is by this time aware there is a misprint at p. 134, 'Anworth' for 'Anwoth,' and that at p. 93 for 'perpendicular' should be read 'horizontal.') W. FULTON.

## *PURPOSE IN CREATION.*

A book of remarkable interest and value has been written on the above subject by the Professor of Anatomy in the University of Manchester, Frederic Wood Jones, D.Sc., F.R.S., F.R.C.S. He calls it simply *Design and Purpose* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.; 5s. net). The main theme which he expounds is stated in the early pages: 'We are all in danger of losing sight of what great minds once conceived to be a patent truth: that the cosmos is an ordered entity. It is true that some of us, realizing the loss that thinking youth has suffered, made some attempt to assure them that the loss is not due to the findings of orthodox science: it is due solely to a lack of any adequate synthesis of these findings.' In expounding this theme Dr. Jones gives us an interesting review of scientific thought on the subject, the most enlightening and important part of which is what he writes about Darwin, and particularly about the use (or misuse) that has been made of Darwin's hypothesis. With the advent of the 'Origin of Species' the all-wise creator vanished from men's minds. The pessimism produced by a general and unthinking belief in the truth of 'Darwinism' coloured the most brilliant findings of that most brilliant scientific period. In particular Nature was seen to be 'red in tooth and claw,' a place of relentless competition of bloody strife and ultimate elimination of the weak in favour of the strong—a conception popularized by Huxley in England and Haeckel in Germany.

Dr. Jones points out that Darwin, being largely a field naturalist, had no such idea of a bloody strife in Nature. Even the term 'struggle for existence' was not of his coining. He used the phrase 'natural selection,' meaning by it that Nature played the rôle with wild creatures that the breeder carries out with regard to domestic plants and animals. And, indeed, he lays emphasis on the 'dependence of one being on another' (Darwin's own words). This dependence was a constituent part of Darwin's definition of the struggle for existence. Professor Jones asserts definitely that Huxley's idea of Nature as 'on about the same level as a gladiator's show' is a total misconception. On the contrary it is 'a series of harmonies in which living things play mutually dependent parts.'

This is the most striking part of a book of enthralling interest. But one other feature of Professor Jones's argument is worth mentioning. He contends strongly for a synthetic view of the universe and an emphasis on its wholeness. He would apply the evolutionary conception to Nature, life, mind, to all Nature organic and inorganic. And this leads him to an outlook which is really identical with that of General Smuts of whom he writes with warm appreciation. 'Of Holism,' he says, 'I think it is true to say that it is the grandest attempt at unification since Plato.' And, looking at Nature in this way, we find evidence of plan embracing all things. We are led to the belief that the genetic or evolutionary processes, both cosmic and biological, constitute a single orderly development that yields results not merely contingent but resembling those which in human action we recognize as purposeful. The argument, thus briefly indicated, is presented with great ability and so lucidly that there is no difficulty at any point in following its course. The book is one, I think, of real importance and should be widely read. F. J. RAE.

## *PROFESSOR FARMER ON BELIEF ON GOD.*

Professor H. H. Farmer's well-known book on 'Experience of God,' after a singularly useful and honourable career, has recently gone out of print. Instead of producing a revised edition the author has thought it better to write a completely new book on the same subject, which is now issued under the title of *Towards Belief in God* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). The wisdom of this decision will be manifest to every reader of the book. It has a freshness which no revision of a pre-war book could have, and it embodies the mature thoughts of a living and deep-searching mind which has brooded long on its high theme. Dr. Farmer does not believe there can be any logical demonstration of the being of God; He can only be revealed as person to person through impressions on the heart and decisions of the will. But he does believe that when we bring our faith in God into contact with the facts of Nature and of human life we find certain confirmations of a weighty kind. There remains indeed much that is mysterious and dark, but the Christian hypothesis proves itself more adequate than any other. The sociological and psychological theories of religion are subjected to acute destructive criticism, while the profound problems of human freedom and of evil are dealt with in a most suggestive and helpful way. The book, despite the limits imposed by war-time economy is of considerable length and every page is of the highest excellence and interest.

J. H. MORRISON.

## *THE MYSTERY OF THE PRESENCE.*

*The People and the Presence* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Canon W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.S.O., M.C., D.D., is a study by a well-known Old Testament scholar of the 'At-one-ment.' The central contention of the book is that from Horeb onwards the faith and worship of Israel were focussed on the mystery of the 'tabernacling' Presence, and that this must be duly appreciated for a full understanding of the Bible. More especially should it be observed that the belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence on earth and the later belief in Jahweh as having His dwelling-

place in 'heaven' formed a dualism at the heart of Covenant-Religion which was only resolved in Christ, who came down from heaven and dwelt amongst us and in us. In the God-Man the People and the Presence meet in a mysterious 'At-one-ment.'

Biblical scholars should consider this thesis very seriously. It is inspired by imaginative insight and developed with scholarly care and thoroughness. In Part I. it is maintained that the belief in the earthly Presence was even enhanced by the experiences of the exilic and post-exilic days, and in Part II. the doctrine of the Presence is traced in St. Mark's Gospel and in the teaching of St. Stephen, St. Paul, and St. John. But in Part II. the old dualism is seen as an essential stage in the working out of the Eternal Purpose to 'sum up all things in Christ.' As the author expresses it, 'a new Body of flesh and blood has come into being through His Death and Resurrection; and this Body which is the first-fruits of a universal At-one-ment is indwelt and knit together by the Spirit of Him who is Eternal At-one-ness, Holy Trinity. Man in Christ is gathered up into the heart of God.'

It is largely because 'Naomorphism' (Sanctuary-Symbolism) is virtually absent from the Epistle to the Hebrews that there has been so great neglect in Christian circles of the mystery of the Presence—so the author affirms; and he further affirms that its transcendent monotheism (the wholly upward-looking type of religion) has had its day, and that Christianity—rightly understood—is not a religion of transcendent monotheism, but the revelation of transcendent-immanent Trinity in Unity.

Undoubtedly this is a challenging book, and it should be of particular interest to the Biblical exegete, showing as it does intimate knowledge of the Biblical texts, a wide range of learning, and much boldness and skill in interpretation.

W. FULTON.

---

The Rev. D. R. Davies has followed his 'On to Orthodoxy' and 'Secular Illusion' with a congenial exposition of the General Confession. The cryptic title is taken from the Book of Homilies: 'Wherefore, good people, let us beware of such hypocrisy, vainglory, and justifying of ourselves. Let us look upon our feet; and then down peacock's feathers, down proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels.' And so *Down Peacock's Feathers* (Centenary Press; 5s. net) sets the keynote for the exposition that follows. Mr. Davies is a vigorous writer, and his book is far more interesting than one would expect from his subject. The reason is that he looks at each phrase in the General Confession in a spacious way. Each one suggests (or asserts) a great truth, and so the discussion is lifted up into a big context where we find ourselves dealing with the meaning of history and the ethical consequence of theology, to name but two subjects of importance. One of the best chapters is on the Corruption of Human Nature, and in this connexion it may be suggested to the author that the doctrine of total depravity does not mean the absolute badness of the whole man so much as the fact that the whole man is affected; sin has corrupted his whole being but not corrupted it wholly. Mr. Davies, however, is an able and persuasive defender of orthodoxy in the ordinary sense of that word, and his books are interesting not only as renderings of catholic truth but as milestones in his own pilgrimage.

---

What are young people really thinking to-day? A challenging answer to this question is offered by Thomas Brendel in a little book which he has called *Abschaffung des Christentums* (Europa Verlag, Zürich). It consists of the meditations of a young Swiss who has set down his thoughts day by day, without concealment and without reservation. He expressly disclaims the name of Christian for himself; his ideal is so high that he cannot attain to it. At the same time he has an intensely strong belief in the Bible. His short, rather disjointed sentences need to be read to be fully appreciated, but it may be noted that his main thesis is the contrast between the 'Gemeinde Christi' and 'Christentum.' The former is adventurous, even revolutionary, and implies that complete faith which makes a man throw away all earthly and human support and fling himself upon God, relying on Him for all he needs in this world and the next. 'Christentum,' on the other hand, is nothing more than an organized religion, doomed to decay. It is tainted by a fatal disease, implanted by the spirit of the 'Bürger,' a term which is used, not in a social or economic sense, but with reference to a certain psychological and ethical type, that which demands above all things a sense of security. With this the true gospel of Christ has nothing in common. The book is courageous and stimulating, even if it leaves many important questions untouched; it might be well if it were made available for the ordinary English reader.

---

*The Future of Faith*, edited by Mr. Percy Colson (Hurst & Blackett; 6s. net), contains 'a diversity of views,' as the sub-title tells us. It is introduced in a rambling essay by Lord Vansittart, who cannot manage to keep King Charles's head out of his discourse. There are contributions (by the people named or from their writings) from the Dean of St. Paul's, the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead, Cardinal Hinsley, Dr. Hertz, Dr. Basil Yeaxlee, and many others (about sixteen in all), and the views range from Atheism to Theosophy. The editor plays the part of the Greek chorus. He has himself no very positive belief, but he is immensely interested in the beliefs of others. Like many who are in his position he greatly admires the Roman Catholic Church and in a discussion of it commits himself to the following absurdity: 'If one can be a believing member of the Church of England I cannot for the life of me understand what there is to boggle at in Catholicism!' The symposium Mr. Colson has gathered is full of interest. The writers contend warmly for their own standpoints, and it is always

of value to listen to anyone who really believes something.

---

At a time like the present, when Jews throughout western Europe are suffering as they have not done for centuries, such a book as Mr. Abraham A. Neuman's *The Jews in Spain* is particularly welcome (Jewish Publication Society of America; 2 volumes, $5.00). It offers a remarkably complete survey of Judaism as seen under the best conditions during the Middle Ages. Here we find Jews taking an important place in the community, often attaining positions of responsibility and authority. As in Plantagenet England the relation between the Jewish community and the Crown was particularly close, and, in spite of popular prejudice and ecclesiastical fanaticism, Sephardi Judaism flourished under the shadow of the throne. There were, of course, tragedies like the great pogrom of 1391, but, in the main, neither papal bull, aristocratic jealousy nor mob turbulence could shake the position of the Jew till (in the year in which America was discovered!) the religious enthusiasm of Queen Isabella broke the link which united Jewry to the Courts of Spain. This book is not a history—indeed, it presupposes a considerable knowledge of Spanish history—but it is a striking picture of the life of the Jewish community, both in itself and in its relations with its Christian and Moorish environment, based on thorough and comprehensive research.

---

*Racialism and World Faith* (Lutterworth Press; 6s. net) is the topical title of a Study of the Epistle to the Galatians by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith. It has been argued that this Epistle shows Christianity to have been a popular movement in which, even in the time of St. Paul, Jesus was no more than a shadowy Figure. The author's aim is to controvert this interpretation and at the same time to raise certain fundamental questions of the Christian Faith; in particular, the question of the issue between the Judaic religion of race and missionary Christianity, an issue reflected in the contemporary situation. But this book is not merely an essay based upon the Epistle to the Galatians, it is a commentary on the Epistle in the usual sense of the term. Quoting freely from Chrysostom, Luther and Calvin, Wyclif, Lightfoot, and others, the writer expounds the teaching of the Epistle section by section, but always with an eye to the critical happenings of our day. The text of each section is given in a useful paraphrastic version, and the exposition is on simple and popular lines. We commend the book to the preacher and teacher.

---

A very beautiful little book on the Lord's Supper has been written by the Rev. W. Robinson. It is called *A Companion to the Communion Service* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). It is introduced by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem and amply earns the appreciation he bestows on it. In simple words, penetrated by devout feeling and spiritual insight, Mr. Robinson explains the nature of the service of Holy Communion, gives us helpful guidance in preparing ourselves for it, and in carrying its spirit into our ordinary lives, and furnishes forms of prayer for each stage of the service. The best thing one can say about this little manual is that it is worthy of its subject and will provide for the earnest communicant the assistance he needs and seeks.

---

*Thou Must Venture*, by Mr. E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D. (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net), is a series of thirty brief studies on Christian themes which combine solid thinking with evangelical passion. The writer, who is Lecturer in Theology and Religious Knowledge in the University of Durham, says in his introduction, 'The thought which governs this book is that there is a truth of God which we do not make, but only find; but stress is laid on our finding it.' The book is divided into three parts, the Gospel of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and Ourselves and the Gospel. The style is lucid and the writer has drawn his illustrations from his own exceptionally varied experience and from a wide knowledge of good literature. The whole makes a model of expository preaching.

---

*Science and the Spiritual*, by Professor T. E. Jessop (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), is No. 16 of 'The Christian News-Letter Books.' To apply the term 'news-letter' to it is somewhat of a misnomer. It consists of four lectures on the reality and validity of ideals and the metaphysic which they imply. These lectures are wrought into a closely knit argument presented with great clearness and force. The materialistic presuppositions of modern science, and particularly of psychology, are keenly criticised, and absolute determinism is shown to be suicidal. Room must be found for the ideals of truth, beauty and goodness, and these in their turn require the postulation of a superhuman spirit as their home. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the cogency of reasoning and clarity of style which characterize this little book. It deserves to be read and re-read.

---

*The Abolition of Christianity*, by Mr. John Maarten (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), recalls the title of Professor Bowman's book, 'The Absurdity of Christianity.' But the meaning of Christianity is quite different in the two books and their motive and purpose are different. Mr. Maarten really wishes to abolish Christianity. But, then, he means by Christianity something bad. He calls it bourgeois, self-satisfied, rotten, outmoded, useless, harmful. 'Must it not be abolished'? Christianity only appeared when men were bent on insuring themselves against reality. It is different with discipleship which really believes and really bows before Christ. The writer sees disciples going back to the primitive obedience to Christ and casting from them all the impedimenta that make 'Christianity' an empty thing.

# A Reasoned Approach to Religion.

By the Reverend G. Parrinder, B.A., B.D., Redruth.

## I. Creative Mind.

'Newton banished God from Nature. . . . He had shown that the cosmos was a blind machine.'

'Darwin banished God from life. . . . He had proved life meant, and had, as little purpose as the universe . . . all life would end in futility and be as though it had never been.'

'Freud drove God from the last fastness, the soul.' He maintained that 'conscience is not only harmful but unnecessary, and as unnecessary as harmful.' [1]

Such was the work of those scientists who treated the universe, life, and man as machines. The gods were dead. So also inevitably were freedom, justice, beauty, and love. Proof can be seen in the reversion of the modern world to the violence of barbarism.

To-day, the mechanistic explanation of the universe is dead also; no reputable thinker regards the universe as a machine; although, thought being ahead of action, the effects of this attitude are not yet fully worked out in conduct. Life is all-pervasive, its essence unexplained, and its action largely unpredictable. Freud and the Behaviourists, who think of man as a machine without freewill, base their fancies upon the outworn physics of the last century.

The mistake of rationalism in the past was to identify itself with mechanism. For mechanism is not rational; it does not explain, nor yet take into account all the facts. There is Mind in the universe, man is more than a machine, as the most rational common-sense insists, and man has a degree of liberty.

If we would find a rational explanation of the world and human life we must not be blinkered by mechanistic pre-suppositions, but must take into account all the relevant factors, spiritual as well as physical, religious and æsthetic as well as scientific.

Contemplating thus the physical universe we cannot help being impressed by the orderliness of Nature and the beauty of its diverse manifestations. Our own love of law and harmony is spiritual, and we feel a kinship on this plane with a Mind communicating with our minds through the medium of Nature.

> I felt the sentiment of Being spread
> O'er all that moves and all that seemeth still.

[1] G. Heard, *The Third Morality*, 23–34.

This is the argument of the Old Teleological (Design, or Purpose) Proof of the existence of God, to which Kant was particularly tender and which goes back at least as far as Aristotle. The presence of order in the world indicates a designer-God. Jeans says, 'We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds.' And Darwin felt the 'impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity of looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man.'

Two qualifications must, however, be made to the old form of this argument. First, it need not imply omnipotence, in the sense in which that attribute is vulgarly understood. If there is an architect, it is obvious that his action is limited by the nature of his material, as a poet's expression is limited yet thereby made poetical by the forms of metre and rhyme.

Then, the order of the world, since we reject mechanism, is not externally or mechanically imposed from without but proceeds from within. So that we do not so much talk of outward design, but of inward purpose. This is the point of the two apparently contradictory references to Darwin above. Darwin felt the necessity of postulating a First Cause; God wound up the clock, but after that he proceeded to treat the universe as if God had retired from it. His followers got rid of God from the beginning by abolishing the beginning.

But we see God in the world because of the order proceeding from purpose which is immanent in all forms. All living forms strive to develop themselves to achieve organic *ends*. Whether the *means* are developed or given, whether the ox thrusts because he has a horn, or develops a horn in order to thrust, is beside the point.[2] The fact remains that all life is inspired by an activity directed to an end. And this purposiveness is continuous, from inorganic to animal to man. And in man it is both conscious and free. But even in the inorganic forms, though it may be treated in mechanistic fashion for convenience of abstraction, yet the purpose there seen can only be *understood* as the expression of thought. Matter and its growth are manifestations of Mind.

[2] See G. Galloway, *The Philosophy of Religion*, 350 n.

Instead, then, of speaking of a First Cause which designs the world, modern thinkers trace its orderliness to purposive Life, and speak of a Life-Force or a Universe-Mind. Certainly it is more true to consider the principle of the universe as life than as dead mechanism, and this Life terminology is that employed so widely by Henri Bergson. Yet the exaltation of intuition and emotion, and the depreciation of reason and goodness, commonly associated with this interpretation of the universe are certainly objectionable.

We can see life at work. We can observe adaptation and ends, the purposes to which life is striving. Can we go any farther ?

We can indeed if we are to take all the facts into account. For we have not yet considered in his distinctiveness the greatest phenomenon of the visible world,—Man. It is curious that many modern thinkers have been so obsessed with man's kinship with the rest of Nature that they have neglected his great and essential separateness. Thus psychologists declare that there is no religious instinct because it is not apparent in animals. Whether this be so or not, and we are not disputing that here, it is manifest that animals have no religious observances because of an essential difference between their constitution and that of man. At all events, there has been an almost culpable unwillingness to deduce from the given fact of man's distinctiveness the implications contained therein as to the nature of the Supreme Reality behind all life.

One may speak, as is the fashion, of Life with a capital L ; or discourse of a Universe-mind yet mean little more than a blind urge. But in man we see not mere life or instinct, but Reason and Spirit.

One suspects that the use of the words Life and Mind, without precise definition, is an evasion of the main issue raised by the presence of man in the universe. Life may seem a convenient word to use, better than mechanism, but less than reason or consciousness. Its convenience lies in its ambiguity ; it may be taken for either mechanism or intelligence, and man may be lumped in with the stones as if he were not differentiated and superior. But man's superiority involves a judgment of value ; for otherwise why should he be thought better than the inorganic world ? Our standard of value depends upon our conception of the nature of the Supreme Reality.

In man Life is seen in consciousness, both of himself and of the world. Man is distinctive because he thinks.

If man thinks, can the Universe-mind which informs the world with order and purpose and which produced man be inferior to its product ? Can unconsciousness create a self-conscious being ? Can meaninglessness account for a purposeful thinking spirit ? We can account for the lower forms from our knowledge of the higher, but the higher forms are not explicable as mere resultants of lower forms.

If the life-urge is blind it is not intelligible that consciousness should issue from it. That consciousness is an advantage to the progress of the organism is obvious, but the fact of advantage is no adequate *reason* for its appearance and development. It is the *capacity* that would be required in the blind urge, so that consciousness and wakefulness might be produced, which is not intelligible.[1]

If there is a Universe-mind, then this mind is at least conscious in man, as the crown of life. But is it not incredible to maintain that the Universe-mind was unconscious before the development of thinking man, and would relapse into unconsciousness if all men were annihilated ?

On the other hand, if we assume Creative Mind, using the term mind in the legitimate fashion as conscious, for that is the only sense that we can give to it, then the whole of life, including man, falls into shape. This Conscious Mind is the ground of the whole of life, giving the conditions and the possibility of order and purpose, and making evolution intelligible. The lower form does not simply produce the higher out of nothing like a conjurer, for active self-consciousness has been present from the first.

What is the nature of this Mind ? Can we communicate with it ? These questions, which are fundamental to religion, will now concern us.

(Physical) 'science does not indicate whether the world-spirit is good or evil ; but it does perhaps justify us in applying the adjective "creative." It is for other considerations to examine the daring hypothesis that the spirit in whom we have our being—our actuality—is approachable to us ; that He is to us the beneficent Father, without which, it seems to me, the question of the theoretical existence of a God has little significance. This image of the divine nature is not a convenient fiction for use in workaday life, to be discarded in favour of a system of equations when scientific accuracy is required. If the hypothesis is correct, it signifies a direct relation of spirit to spirit which can scarcely be made clearer by an irrelevant excursion into the cycle of physical definition where the differential equations take their rise ; it is more nearly expressed by reference to a relationship of spirit to spirit on the human plane —a relation which means much more than physical science is able to formulate.' [2]

[1] Galloway, 432.

[2] Sir Arthur Eddington in *Science, Religion, and Reality*.

### II. Personality in God.

'To-day there is but one religious dogma in debate: What do you mean by God?' Thus Professor A. N. Whitehead. And by the side of this statement we may place the passage quoted previously from Eddington, to the effect that the theoretical existence of God is a question of no significance unless God be a beneficent Father.

The meaning attached to the words God and Religion by some influential modern writers, Heard, Lippmann, the Huxleys, and even Whitehead, is far from the significance insisted upon with no uncertain voice by the historical religions.

There is a curious reluctance in these writers to attribute personality to God. They prefer to speak of God or Mind as 'impersonal,' the assumption being that by this usage a higher plane of thought is reached than that common to the highest religions, which are stigmatized as 'anthropomorphic'—they make God in the image of man.

Julian Huxley's book *Religion without Revelation* may be taken as typical. Huxley writes of 'the liberation of the idea of God from the shackles of personality,' as if the category of personality were inferior to that of substance, and expresses his 'conviction that religion of the highest and fullest character can co-exist with a complete absence of belief in revelation in any straightforward sense of the word, and in that kernel of revealed religion, a personal God.'

It may be noted, in passing, that Professor Huxley attaches to the notion of a personal God the attribute of omnipotence, with which it has no necessary connexion. He finds the problem of evil in the world to consist largely in the relations of evil and omnipotence, though on the next page he disposes of physical evils quite comfortably by scientific explanation without thereby discrediting the divine personality.

At bottom, Huxley's real objection is not merely to personality in God, but to God altogether; except as Life with a capital letter. He does not say this, except by implication, because he wishes to retain religion and the religious sense.

Historically, at least, religion has not existed without belief in a personal God. Neither can reason show any cause for retaining belief in God once the possibility of personal relationships with Him is disposed of; religion vanishes, except as a 'hang-over' due to habit and training.

Professor Farmer neatly characterizes the impersonalists' attachment to religion as 'a religious atavism.' 'An impersonalist theory of the universe is wrought out on rational grounds, and, on the other hand, certain religious moods are experienced. . . . The question is whether they can be harmonized with each other *at the moment of the religious feelings*. . . . What happens is that at the moment of the religious response there is an implicit awareness of the *personal* quality of ultimate reality, union with which is so blissfully felt.' Far from being a superior or mature form of religion this is 'rudimentary religion inhibited from its proper development by a false metaphysic.' [1]

Similarly Lippmann's 'high religion of maturity' is not a religion at all. He talks about the 'spiritual' without defining it, and endeavours to enforce the 'ought' in conduct without realizing the religious assumptions which are essential to it. Like Huxley, in his moral teaching Lippmann tries to steal the thunder of religion while rejecting its essential basis.

Huxley and the impersonalists cannot have it both ways. Either they must accept a personal God as the foundation of their religion, or else they must abandon the name religion altogether. For the fact is that religion is at heart a belief in a personal God. This is the central meaning of the 'supernatural'; that the Reality beyond man communes with him personally.

Buddhism is often claimed as an exception to the personalistic character of religion. The appearance is deceptive. For in its origin, as far as can be accurately determined, Buddhism was not a religion but a world-renouncing way of life for the few based on Hindu philosophy. Buddhism only became a religion when its founder was deified and worshipped, not to mention the innumerable deities added later; in short, when men felt the need for a personal God.

By a converse process, some mystics who have endeavoured to pass beyond the worship of a personal God have done so to the impoverishment of their religion. To speak of God as a Divine Abyss or Superessential Nothingness is not to honour Him; it is to dismiss Him by removing Him to a distance too far to be of any value to the worshipper. Prayer has been degraded into vacuity and unchecked wandering of the imagination, for our minds must have an Object.

Pantheism, which would merge the worshipper into the Divine Darkness, is with difficulty distinguished from atheism. Not only is God depersonalized; man is also. Religion and morals alike vanish into the universal vacuum. In India, the popular polytheism and the purer Bhakti cult of devotion to a personal God have saved religion from the acids of pantheistic philosophy.

While man is akin to God, as child to Father, yet there is a fundamental separation of value and relationship in the natures of God and man. There must be a certain dualism, else all distinctions are obliterated.

[1] *The World and God*, 31.

It is true that the divine personality has often been conceived in terms of the starkest crudity in all religions, and in Protestantism as well as in Roman Catholicism. Impersonalistic theories must be understood as largely due to reaction against intemperate cults of Mary and Jesus, and the polytheism of the popular conception of the Trinity. But to whittle off crude interpretations is different from removing the central object of religion. It is time for the reaction to become less extreme, and to find the means wherein lies the truth.

Finally, on the apologetic side, reference may be made to the theories of Freud to the effect that religion is 'a dislocation in the family life of the primitive horde,' and God a projection of the Father-Imago.

It is a fact that the father-relationship enters into religion, but even where it is most crudely expressed that cannot in the slightest degree disprove the existence of God: it can only show a certain conception of Him to be inadequate, just as the use of the notion of Force in physical science, admittedly derived from subjective feeling however crudely expressed, does not disprove the existence of the electron. The apprehension of a Creative Mind related to human spirits as Father is based both upon experience and upon rational deduction from given facts, both material and spiritual. It is outside the province of psychology to deny the existence of this reality; only rational argument, interpreting the universe and man more fully, can legitimately offer itself as a better interpretation.

From analogy in human nature, while all thought is of necessity anthropomorphic, it is not unjust to attribute to God the best that we see in ourselves. Hence the Divine Being must include consciousness and personality, as well as possessing man's highest attributes—truth, beauty, and goodness.

All that religion is concerned to maintain is the possibility of *personal relations* with the Supreme Reality, therefore we are obliged to assume that in that Reality there exists whatever is necessary for such relations.

Religion, as indeed all thought, works by means of mental symbols. We must form some picture of God. To the impersonalist that picture would be a vague cloud, an abyss of unknowing. But the best symbol of God is surely the highest personality that we have known, Christ, 'the image of God.'

In short, a supra-personal God is the life breath of all religion. An undefined 'universe-mind' (Heard), or a 'principle of concretion' (Whitehead), or an 'invisible King' (in the Wellsian sense), cannot be a satisfying object of religion. Without repudiating the rightful place of philosophy, the religious consciousness must yet affirm that not the blind undifferentiated Life of monism, but the God of Jesus and the prophets is the God of all reasonable and living religion.

# In the Study.

## Virginibus Puerisque.

### Hide and Seek.

By the Reverend Rolf Gledhill, M.A., Edgbaston, Birmingham.

'Seek, and ye shall find.'—Mt $7^{7}$.

How often have you played that game called 'Hide and Seek'? It is a game we can play in so many ways. Sometimes a thing is hidden and sometimes a person is hidden, and the others have to go and seek. And for all who play the game it is essential that they keep on seeking. The harder it is to find, the more determined the seekers are to continue; and the greater is the joy and triumph when something that has been hidden, in a very difficult place, is found at last.

I wonder how often you play this game? Do you realize that you play it all the time you are at school? There is something hidden that you have to find. Perhaps it is a new world of literature that lies hidden except to those who are willing to go on looking for it. Perhaps you are having music lessons. Only those who keep on trying will find the new world of melody. So many of the great and beautiful things in life seem hidden. But they can always be found by those who are willing to keep on looking for them.

So 'Hide and Seek' is not simply a game of childhood days. It tells us something important about the great game of life. There are new worlds waiting to be discovered by those who are eager and willing to seek. They never come to us. We must find them. You will all have heard about Columbus, and how he discovered the 'New World.' He believed that if only he could sail westward over the seas from Spain he would reach the other side of the world. At first no one would believe him. His friends mocked at his wild dreams. He appealed to the King of Spain for help in his great plan. But no one seemed eager to help him. Yet Columbus was determined to keep on trying. And at last he succeeded in getting the help he needed. In August 1492 he was able to set sail with three ships on his voyage of seeking. His task was no easy one. The journey was long and tedious; the crew began to doubt whether they should ever find the hidden land they were seeking; they talked about

giving up the useless search. Then, after two months of seeking, one October night, Columbus thought he saw a light shining in the distance. 'A light—a flickering light—a light in the distance! Can it be land?' The long search was over. In the morning Columbus went ashore. His first act was to kneel down and give thanks to God. The 'new world' had been discovered. It was a great triumph for the man who was willing to keep on trying.

Jesus told us about a 'new world' which is waiting for us to find. He called it the Kingdom of Heaven. To find this new world is the greatest joy we can ever know. But it can only be found by those who are determined to keep on seeking for it. The picture that Jesus gave of a man finding this kingdom is of a merchantman seeking goodly pearls. He finds, in his search, first one pearl, then another. Finally he finds one pearl which is finer than all the others. This one pearl is of such great worth that the merchant willingly gives all that he has to obtain it. So in life's game of 'Hide and Seek' we find in our search many lovely and precious things. We enter fairy-lands as we learn the magic of words, we find the joys of colour, and music, and Nature. But the greatest discovery of all is when we find 'the kingdom of heaven.'

There may be some who doubt, and others who scorn this idea of a 'new world' for us to find. Columbus knew a great deal about those who disbelieved. But he was determined to keep on searching. And if we are willing to seek, we too shall find. We have our chart and our compass in our prayer and worship. This is the way we must travel. The new world of joy and peace will not come to us. We must do the seeking. For all who search the reward is certain. Like Columbus we shall find a 'new world.' Like him, our first act on finding this 'new world' will be to kneel down and thank God. For we shall know so clearly that we are in His world.

'Seek and ye shall find' . . . or shall we give these words their original meaning, *Keep on seeking and you shall find*. The Kingdom of Heaven will never be found by the half-hearted and the indifferent. The fulness of its joy can only be known to those who will keep on seeking. May the New Year bring us into this 'new world.' To so many, joy and peace are hidden. But they can be found and known by all brave seekers.

### 'The Pulley.'

By the Reverend D. S. Robertson, B.D.,
Knockbain, Munlochy.

'The cords of a man, and the bands of love.'—Hos $11^4$.

I was in a shop one day when the man who was serving me suddenly said, 'Look, there's a sheave.' For the moment I didn't grasp what he meant, then I saw what he was holding in his hand . . . a wheel flanged for carrying a rope in a pulley, or as it was in this case, the wheel from a block and tackle. I looked at that little wheel with something like reverence, for it represented one of the really important discoveries that man has made. It is an example of the principle of the lever, which was the means by which men first learned to lift heavy weights easily. Before that discovery, everything had to be done by sheer brute force, but with the lever in his hand, a man could perform miracles. Scissors, shears, wheelbarrows, carts, cranes, bridles, wheels, and pulleys of every kind are all examples of the lever, so you see how important it is. It is no wonder that the man who discovered it is reported to have said that if only he had a place to stand on, he would guarantee to lift the world!

The pulley is perhaps the one that fascinates us most. With a proper tackle, a child can lift a weight much heavier than himself far into the air. With pulleys we can bring up coal from the deepest mines, and dredge wrecks from the ocean floor. We can master height and depth and weight, if only we have the proper tackle for doing it.

And it's not only we who can use pulleys. The text shows us how God lifts us out of wrong-doing and unhappiness by a different kind of pulley, which the prophet calls 'the cords of a man and the bands of love.' Where force would fail, and brutality be useless, God uses love as the means of drawing us to Himself.

One of the great English poets has a very beautiful poem on that, and curiously enough, the title of the poem is 'The Pulley.' It describes how God made man rather like an empty vessel, and had a glass filled with blessings standing by. Gradually He poured those blessings into our nature; first, Strength, then Beauty, Wisdom, Honour, Pleasure, and so on until the glass was nearly empty. Then He stopped. God looked into the glass and saw Rest lying in the bottom, the only blessing man didn't have. But God decided not to give man that blessing, He kept it as the pulley by which He could draw man back to Himself. For He said, if man had everything he has got, and Rest along with it, then he would be utterly content with himself and this world. He would never feel any need for God, and he would go his own way, forgetting the Father in Heaven who made him and loves him. But as it is, God has made us rich in many wonderful ways, and yet not quite satisfied with our life and with ourselves, always reaching out for something beyond. So God kept Rest to Himself, so that He could use it as a pulley to draw us back to Himself.

## The Christian Year.

### Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

### Patience.

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D.,
Chaplain, Royal Navy.

'Now the God of patience . . . grant you to be likeminded.'—Ro $15^5$.

Christian teaching about God centres in the statement that He is like a father. The longing

of Christians to teach fear-ridden folk to begin their prayers with 'Our Father' has been largely responsible for the world-wide expansion of Christianity.

Yet it is important to remember that, in many ways, God is not at all like a father, at least not like any earthly father we have ever known. There is no self-seeking, no thought of His own aggrandisement in the love of God for His children; and of what human father could that be said? God is never tyrannical or cruel or jealous as we are at times with our children. Above all, as our text reminds us, He is never impatient. He never tires of taking the long way with us, never takes refuge, as we are apt to do, either in a foolish indulgence to save trouble, or in an angry blow to avoid the tedium of explanation. Always our God is a God of patience.

In all of His Creation there are no signs of short cuts, of hasty or shoddy work. Through the long æons the Great Architect, out of nothing, fashioned this wondrous world. Then, as the crown of His creation, He made man and woman to dwell in it—beings capable of communion with Himself.

When man rebelled and defied Him, we see the same endless patience in God's plan of redemption. He showed man the Law by which he must live, and, when His chosen people departed from it, He sent His prophets to recall them to their true obedience. When the prophets were stoned, God did not lose patience, but sent His own dear Son to redeem them. Even when we killed the Well-beloved, God did not give us up as hopeless; did not, as we should have done, rub the whole thing out as a failure.

All down through the Christian centuries, the Son, risen and exalted, has yet continued to humble Himself, showing Himself to Jew and Gentile alike, as a suppliant, pleading for that allegiance which is His by right. Still to-day Christ chooses only the compulsion of patient love, waiting till, above the clamour of their fighting, men hear His knocking at the door; and admit Him to what He could all along have taken by force if He had willed, the Lordship of their lives. Truly our God is a God of patience, of patience too wonderful even to be understood by men.

Yet Paul prays here that the Romans—that we—may be like-minded. If we are to fulfil Christ's command to be perfect as the Father, then we must learn to be like Him in this most God-like quality of patience. There is some faint analogy of the Love of God in the love of parent for child or of man for woman. There is some hint of His Holiness in the revulsion against evil of even the worst of us. But to mirror in any degree the limitless patience of God seems almost beyond our power. We are too cowed by time, too oppressed with the knowledge of our own mortality, of the few short years that defend us from death. Some nevertheless have found this grace, and they, most often, those who know that they have the least time before them. We, too, must try.

We must try, first of all, to be more patient with ourselves. Once the realization of God's forgiveness of us has first burst upon our souls, we are so keen for Him to finish the work He has begun, that we tend to become impatient with ourselves. The old sin comes back; the old selfishness returns, and we decide out of hand that we have no genius for religion, no flair for the Christian life. If we think a little at such times of the patience of God in Christ, we won't give ourselves up in disgust. *He* thought we were worth saving, that we could do better. Let's pick ourselves up, and be on our pilgrim way. By His grace we shall do better.

A more common fault is to lose patience with others. Our brethren seem a mass of ancient prejudice and selfish pride. The world cannot get along for them, and we cannot get along with them. We burst into God's presence, full of indignation and self-righteousness, and we tell Him that we simply cannot stand these people He has set us among, pour forth to Him the sins of these, 'Thy sons.' Perhaps then, in the presence of the Father, our 'Thy sons' will be echoed by a 'These, thy brethren.' We shall remember God's patience with us, what He has suffered, has stood from us. Then we shall leave the Secret Place with the prayer on our lips, 'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. Have patience with us, O Father, as we have patience with these, Thy children.' We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, and that should make us tolerant, humble and, above all, patient with the frailties of our neighbours.

The greatest lesson of all that we, in these days, have to learn, is how to be patient with Him to whom a thousand years are as a day. The 'How long, O Lord? How long?' of the saints is so apt to become a cry of petulant and querulous rebellion. As our souls are seared and our sanity rocks at the bitterness and sorrow and horror of war, we are apt to cry, 'Why doesn't God do something? Why, if He is a loving Father, doesn't He stop the whole beastly, bloody business?' The seeming leisureliness of God becomes almost more than we can bear.

Some impatience, especially if it is directed against our own failures, is no doubt inevitable, and in some measure quite proper. It seems in some people, however, and these not the humblest, to have passed all bounds. Not content with anticipating the end of the war, they busy themselves with blueprints for the ages after. From this error at least, the service man, who lives from day to day, is saved. He is content if 'this day' he can see and do his duty without peering into God's to-morrow, or smudging with impious hands the perfect plans of Providence. After the war, God will not be dead. He will be ready with His commands for each one of us, and with daily strength to enable us to obey them.

One of the things we Christians must learn is to wait for the vision in patience, even though it tarry; knowing, as we do, that it will surely come. That is true of peace, and it is also true of the lasting peace which will come only with the coming of the Son of Man in His Glory.

I remember the seemingly endless wait as we stood in the crowd for the procession at the Coronation of the present King. It appeared certain that something had happened to delay him. We could not credit the evidence of our watches, when, at last, at the exact time announced, the King came.

So it is, as we watch and wait for the coming of the Great King. But God is not slow to keep His promises, although He may seem so as our weary eyes scan the horizon for the signs of His coming.

Just as, at the precise moment when the fullness of time was come, Christ appeared to satisfy the longing of an Anna or a Simeon; so also at the exact time appointed, when God's preparation of us and of the world is complete, our patience shall be rewarded and the King shall appear.

So let us not grow weary in well-doing, impatient with our own slow progress, our neighbours' frailties or with the slow dawning of the glory of the coming of the Lord. Rather let us pray that the God of patience may grant us to be like-minded with Himself through Jesus Christ Our Lord.

---

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

### The Beauty of Sonship.

'Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.'—Gal $4^{7}$.

We need not accept Paul's arguments in order to agree with his conclusion. Always his footsteps were dogged by enemies who sought to undo his work, casting scorn upon his status as an Apostle. Some Jews, who had accepted Christianity, sought to persuade Gentile Christians to accept the Law as well as the gospel. They had created strife among the Christians of Galatia, and in this Epistle Paul is dealing with the resultant situation. He tells those to whom he is writing that their faith in Christ has set them free from the bondage of the Law, that the Law was a mere tutor to bring them to the feet of Christ, and that they are no longer in bondage. No more are they servants or slaves, but sons, and heirs of God through Christ. We need not follow his logic, but our hearts should leap to his magnificent conclusions. The words of our text sum up our position, and our prospects, as believers in God through Jesus Christ. It *is* the big view of life. It should help us to hold high our heads and to walk the world with a firmer tread.

The Apostle means every word. We are no longer servants or slaves, but sons and heirs of God through Jesus Christ. He is not swept off his feet by the intensity of his feelings. This sentiment is to be found again and again in all his writings, and it expresses not only his own considered verdict, but also his personal experience. He knew in whom he had believed, and he knew what this faith had done for him. It had given him new significance and new dignity, and he was anxious that all believers in Jesus Christ should share his experience.

*Do we recognize ourselves as sons and heirs?* That is the question raised by this great claim. More pertinently, perhaps, does the world recognize us as such? Are we not rather too apologetic about the faith delivered to the saints? Is there anything in our bearing, our poise, our impact upon our fellowmen that compels their awareness of our 'standing' in Christ Jesus?

'The whole of creation groaneth and travaileth together until now, waiting . . .' For what? '*Waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.*' One might say that in these words Paul stated his doctrine of Evolution long before Darwin was born. The world will never be set free, never be lifted into new planes of life and liberty, and men will never lose the badges of their servitude, until the 'sons of God' show the true way to freedom.

*Or it may be we have not recognized and claimed our kingdom!* Neil Munro once wrote a sketch of a man who unexpectedly inherited a great fortune. He was a poor man inured to hard, unremittent toil for which he received a miserable pittance. But either he could not, or would not, realize the significance of the wonderful thing that had happened. He preferred to leave his new riches untouched and went on working hard, earning his eighteen shillings a week. Is not this a parable of many a Christian life?

*We need to recover a deep, abiding sense of the dignity and grandeur of our faith.* An older generation of theologians had developed a fine art of logical analysis. They were accustomed to draw a distinction between our *standing* and our *state* as believers in Christ. Our *standing* is secure! Nothing that we do can affect it. The grace of God is involved and cannot be deflected or defeated. We are 'sons and heirs!' *The trouble lies in our 'state.'* Our sense of our relationship to God is defective. We have not realized that we are 'sons and heirs of God.' How can this be remedied? How can the power and beauty of sonship be seen in us?

At least three things are necessary. The first is *Reverence.* There can be no real sonship without it. Christianity is a family religion. Its characteristic terms are fatherhood and sonship. Now, in every true human family relationship reverence is necessary. We cannot truly love what we do not reverence. Again, we can be truly humble only in the presence of what we reverence. Were Plato alive, or Aristotle, and were they to compile for us a list of the virtues, one is almost persuaded they would head that list with reverence.

*We do need to recover a deep sense of reverence for God.* Our most holy faith has suffered, and is suffering still, from a too saccharine conception of God. Men and women have persuaded themselves, if some modern novelists are to be believed, that they can play fast and loose with the moral law, and that God, in His benevolent kindness, will overlook it. We are in real danger of losing sight of the majesty, the power, the holiness and unfathomableness of Almighty God! Is it not a strange paradox that, whilst science is giving us a greatly enhanced conception of the physical

universe, the concept of God is in danger of eclipse? Surely the one implies the other! Surely we must argue that a mighty creation implies a mighty Creator!

The second is *the necessity for intimate communion with God.* Without that, there can be no true sonship. That, too, is another characteristic mark of true family life. Among the privileges of children is that of ready, easy access to their parents. Once the disciples put a straight request to Jesus, 'Show us the Father and it sufficeth us.' To which He returned a wonderful answer, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Such was the wonder of His intimate communion with God. We can share this experience. Christ meant us to share it.

'Mysticism!' we say? There is an element of mysticism in every family relationship on earth. There is always 'the call of the blood.' We need not fear the mystic element in religion. Something in each one of us calls out for communion with God, and can be satisfied with nothing less. That divine spark reveals itself in different ways. It is seen when a young unmarried Salvation Army Officer slips out of a crowded boat in order that a young man might be united to his wife as they escape from a sinking ship. Men and women born with these potentialities in them were made—not to be children of the dust, but children of God, and for communion with Him. Man is not a 'toss-up,' as Dr. C. Montefiore once said. He was made for great things. He is heir, if he will, to a great inheritance. Take the big reading of life, the Christian reading of it. You are meant to be the sons of God. Secure your sonship by keeping open, by way of prayer, praise, and service, the channels of communion with Him.

*And, in the third place, the sons of God are free;* they are not servants or slaves. They are God's freemen, set free from the things that hold multitudes in thrall. They are free from bondage to sin. Christ has struck these shackles from their souls. They have been freed from dejection in a dejected age, for they know the love of God and they confide in it. They are free from bondage to soul-corroding egotism, for they have found a new centre of life in God. For them, 'to live, is Christ!' They are free from 'the fear of being alone,' for they know that One is 'with them alway, even unto the end of the age.' They are free to stand up for all that is good and true, 'for Christ hath conquered there.' They are free from the fear of death for 'Jesus Christ hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.' 'I am come,' said Jesus, 'that ye might be free.' Accept your freedom, now, and possess your heritage in Christ.

'And if sons,' says Paul, 'then heirs, heirs of God through Christ.' Paul was not likely to miss the logical sequence and conclusion of his great argument. What a wonderful conception of life—heirs of God, here and now.

It is the sons of God who truly possess the earth. Wordsworth, the great poet of Nature, practically confesses that when he lost his early sense of God, he also lost his keener appreciation of Nature.

There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream,
The earth, and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream.
It is not now as it hath been of yore;—
Turn wheresoe'er I may,
By night or day,
The things which I have seen I now can see no more.

There is a way to recover the vision. Who is it that possesseth the earth but he who learns to trace everywhere 'the footprints of the Uncreated Wisdom.' 'The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof.' Dr. Jowett has used an illustration to drive home this point. He writes that the lovely county of Devonshire overflows into Somerset, and the traveller passing through the latter on his way to the former foretastes the glory yet to come. So it is with the sons and heirs of God! The openings of the streets of Heaven are on earth.[1]

---

SEPTUAGESIMA.

## The Call to Endurance.

BY THE REVEREND R. J. WEDDERSPOON, M.A., POLLOKSHIELDS, GLASGOW.

'Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.'—He $12^{11}$.

This is a great New Testament verse. It stands complete in itself, and its message is unmistakable. If that message be a reassuring one at all times, it has still greater significance in time of war, when the burden of sorrow lies heavy on many a heart, and the process of chastening may be seen everywhere at work.

We note at the very outset that the Bible states quite frankly that no one likes to be chastened or disciplined. 'No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous.' Let us recognize this fact quite clearly. Nowhere indeed is the pressure of the burden of human misery felt more keenly than by the Biblical writers: nowhere is such moving expression given to the sense of the world's sorrow. 'A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they were not.' The Bible sends its plummet to the very depths of the human heart. There is no magnitude, either of sorrow or of evil, that it does not know. There is no reach of human experience that its words do not traverse. No, the Bible never makes the mistake of minimising the extent or the acuteness of human suffering. It never underestimates the severity of life's discipline. It calls it, indeed, in set terms, a discipline that is 'grievous.'

But it is the way of the Bible, and the way of Christian faith, to take the long view, and in an impatient age like ours, which glorifies short-cuts

[1] J. Short, *All Things are Yours*, 218.

and deifies quick returns, the long view is not altogether popular. That is why many chafe and rebel to-day not only under the discipline of God, but under discipline of any kind. Yet truth abides, and the truth is that nothing effective or worthwhile is ever achieved without discipline that is both strenuous and protracted. For the soldier and for the student alike the one essential is discipline, a rigorous preparatory training that makes a maximum demand upon both mind and body. No profession to-day will look at a man who has not first subjected himself to this initial and trying discipline, and if discipline be necessary in the purposes of mankind here upon earth, shall we not expect discipline in the highest of all purposes that man is given to fulfil?

If we are to be 'heirs of God, joint heirs with Him,' can we expect to enter into the possession of this inheritance without a struggle, without any preparatory discipline whatsoever? One imagines not. Does one become a brilliant writer simply by sitting down to compose a masterpiece straight away? Even a Barrie had to experience the 'fun of working till the stars went out,' while Kipling tells us that on the *Civil and Military Gazette*, of Lahore, on which paper he learned his job, he was 50 per cent. of the staff. He never worked less than ten hours a day and sometimes fifteen. 'I had fever, too, regular and persistent, and chronic dysentery. Yet I discovered that a man can work with a temperature of 104 degrees, even though he has to ask the next day who wrote the article. . . . From the modern point of view I suppose the life was not fit for a dog.'

Yes, but that was how Kipling learned to write.

St. John Ervine has the same story to tell about acting. A lad down from the university, he says, will expect to walk on to the London stage in a leading part, without realizing that it is in the rough and tumble of a repertory or touring theatre that he will learn his job.

These are small matters perhaps, but the same principle is at work in things both small and great. If 'it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings,' can we who are following in His steps expect reservation or exemption?

In this matter there is a kind of rough justice dealt out all round. Perhaps it appears that some people have a very easy time of it compared with others. But bear in mind that there are various ways in which the chastening process may be carried through. The usual form for the discipline of chastening to take is that of personal suffering. But personal suffering can be caused in a whole variety of ways, and by many subsidiary agencies. And it may be that the least severe form of personal suffering that one might be called upon to endure would be caused by the experience of physical pain, shattering as that can be. It may be that we suffer more intensely in the anguish of those whom we love. It may be that we suffer most acutely of all when there is no physical pain involved whatsoever. The most intense and cruel form of suffering is that which is created by the moral delinquencies, the spiritual collapse of those we hold most dear. Make no mistake. No one can 'contract out' of the suffering imposed by this war. If we appear to be personally unaffected, in that none of our own are engaged in the front line of battle, there is all the more reason why we should feel as a scorching flame searing our conscience the moral weakness of civilization that made this war inevitable. We are all being disciplined to-day,

And the discipline, the chastening, we recognize to be salutary. We shall endure it, we must endure it, because we know that there is no other way of harvesting the peaceable fruit of righteousness. We are back indeed at the New Testament position, perhaps all unconsciously, where it is recognized that there is something at stake far greater than any temporary deprivation, however stunning or grievous. For what is at stake is nothing less than the survival of the faith and the freedom of which that faith is the only ultimate guarantee. John Buchan put it very clearly in *Memory Hold the Door*: 'The conflict is not only between the graces of civilization and the rawness of barbarism. . . . I am of Blake's view: Man must and will have some religion: if he has not the religion of Jesus he will have the religion of Satan, and will build a synagogue of Satan.'

What we have glimpsed from afar is the harvesting of the peaceable fruit of righteousness. In the midst of all chastening, that vision makes us strong to endure now. It is the vision, dim and shadowy in its outline compared with this, that Christ had on His Cross. 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.' It is summed up in the great phrase: Nevertheless afterward.

Strong to endure! And who so strong to endure as Christian men and women, dedicated to Him, and owning His Cross as their standard and their hope. If all we knew, or might be likely to know, were the chastening with its dark and grim experiences, if we were simply left there, without vision and without hope, then our plight would be sorry indeed. But all the royal majesty of our Christian faith is there, august, venerable, and intact, to clothe our griefs with a garment of its own spiritual glory, and to weave still another garment of praise for the spirit of our heaviness.

'Nevertheless afterward.' The words come to us like a trumpet call: they bring their own triumph with them. And when the spirit of these words captures the soul, there is conferred a certain immunity even in the midst of the most desolating experiences. When Dr. Barnardo, who was the means in his lifetime of saving 60,000 children, lost three children of his own, he felt the chastening very keenly. When the third child died, he felt for a moment as if he could not go on. But he soon recollected himself. 'The vows of God are on me,' he declared, 'I dare not go back.'

Nevertheless afterward! Remembering that the Christian faith does not know a full stop in its grammar, remembering that after the Cross comes

the Resurrection, that the light affliction which is but for a moment worketh a far more exceeding weight of glory, we determine to endure to the end.

---

SEXAGESIMA.

## A Plea for Narrowness.

'One thing I do.'—Ph $3^{13}$.

I noticed in an article I read some time ago that the writer spoke of Francis of Assisi as the most Christlike person in history. Francis, in the completeness of his surrender and in his self-embraced poverty, was like Him who had not where to lay His head. Perhaps there was more of sheer charm and beauty about Francis than there was about Paul. Still, I adhere to my opinion that Paul was the greatest Christian of all, the greatest disciple Jesus ever had.

But while I give Paul this supreme place I am quite prepared to admit that to some he must have appeared a rather terrible person. He must have been rather a terrible person to all lackadaisical, dilettante, lukewarm folk, for he was a man of *one idea*, a man mastered and absorbed by one great passion.

Men of one idea are always rather terrifying people. I imagine the Roman Senate must have felt Cato was more than a bit of a bore, because, no matter what the subject under discussion, Cato always came back to the same point: '*Delanda est Carthago*' ('Carthage must be destroyed!). In one of his essays, Leslie Stephen, speaking of Robert Owen, says he was one of those intolerable bores who are the salt of the earth. For Robert Owen was a man of one idea. His great idea was that society ought to be a co-operative community. Still, Owen is to be numbered, Leslie Stephen says, amongst those who are the salt of the earth, and to him and his witness the growing sensitiveness of our social conscience is largely due. Well, Paul belonged to that class. He was a man of one idea.

It has been pointed out by writers on St. Paul that in his letters there is no hint of any delight in natural scenery. In the course of his missionary travels, he visited some of the most famous scenes on earth. He visited Antioch, with its famous Grove of Daphne. He crossed the snow-clad Taurus Range. He sailed amongst those isles of Greece which burning Sappho loved and sang. He visited Athens and saw the wonders of the Areopagus. He sojourned in Troas, with its great Homeric memories of the struggle between Trojan and Greek. He sojourned in Rome and gazed upon all its mighty monuments. But he says no word about them. Paul was a traveller, but he was no tourist on the look-out for places of interest. He was on business—the business of preaching the gospel—and from that business of his he allowed nothing to distract him.

Some people might stigmatize this as narrowness. And narrowness it is from one point of view. Paul did not *spread* himself. He concentrated. But isn't that the reason why he has been and still is so potent an influence in the world's life? It is always the men of one idea who get things done. Columbus, with his dream of an undiscovered country in the west. Mazzini, with his dream of a united Italy. Cyrus Field, with his dream of an Atlantic cable. Samuel Plimsoll, with his dream of a safety-loading line for ships. And Paul got things done. 'I laboured,' he says, 'more abundantly than they all.' Before he finished his course, he had lit the lamp of Christian truth in every considerable town between Jerusalem and Rome.

And that is what I want to do this morning—I want to put in a plea for *narrowness*. I am quite well aware that in this age of ours you could scarcely say a more insulting thing about a man than that he is *narrow-minded*. *Breadth* is the quality that commands almost universal admiration to-day. We are so broad that we make no sharp line of demarcation between the decent and the indecent; we smile at things upon which our fathers frowned; we are so broad that we have no fixed beliefs. The present dubious state both of morals and of religion is the result. So I want to put in a plea for a touch of narrowness, because without it life cannot be lived to any great purpose at all.

Of course, it must be the right sort of narrowness. I want no narrowness of *tolerance*. I have no use for bigotry.

The bigot is a man who thinks he knows the truth and the whole of it. His claim is ridiculous, to begin with: it is like saying a child's tin pail can hold the ocean. I would have men cultivate minds which are hospitable to new truth. But I would have them not rest till they have arrived at certain definite convictions, and to these I would have them cling with all the tenacity of their souls. For, I repeat, a certain element of definiteness, narrowness, is a condition of purposeful life.

Consider the truth of this to begin on the *secular level*. Life is never effective when it is diffused. A river that spreads itself out in a score of channels over flat and marshy land becomes slow and stagnant and is useless for the generation of energy. But a river that is confined between narrow banks and which sweeps along with a rush and a swirl generates energy which can be applied by man to a thousand uses. That is what men do when they want to generate electric power: they narrow the stream and send it rushing down in great pipes. The power and energy of a stream are almost in direct proportion to its narrowness. And it is very much like that with life. To be made effective, it must be narrowed and concentrated. You perhaps remember Stevenson's almost passionate words in which he describes his devotion to his art: 'I sleep upon my art as a pillow. I waken in my art. I am not except in my art. My art is me. I am the body of it merely.'

But it is not with secular success I am concerned, but with the making of character and the gaining of soul. 'A man's life,' Jesus said, 'consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he

possesseth.' Life never depends on *things*: life is a matter of character and soul. Now, to gain life in that sense, there has to be a touch of narrowness about us. We have to limit ourselves in this direction and that. I believe that was what Jesus meant—at any rate in part—when He said that 'narrow is the gate and straitened is the way that leadeth unto life.' There is a wide gate and a broad way, walking along which a man need set no restrictions or limitations upon himself; but that broad way, Jesus says, doesn't lead to life; it leads to destruction.

I am not going to stay to ask what exactly that word means, but plainly it must mean something serious. And for that very reason I would give much to see a new touch of stringency and narrowness coming into the lives of our people. I would like to see, for example, a stricter and more austere moral sense. I would like to see our young folk more particular in what they allow themselves, more strict as to the books they read, more strict as to the speech in which they indulge. In a word, I would give much to see a new Puritanism emerging. It is fashionable, no doubt, to sneer and poke fun at the Puritan and his austerities. But he is a shallow fool who does not see the Puritan's real greatness. He was on the whole the biggest man that England produced. He was the real maker of America. The Puritan was narrow, but he was narrow in the interests of life.

So, I repeat, I would give much to see the emergence of a new Puritanism—an order of men and women who recognize that there are rules to be kept and limitations to be observed if the game of life is to be well and truly played. It will be a humaner and more genial Puritanism than the old; it will not frown on music and art and innocent pleasure, but, like the old Puritanism, it will keep its eye on life—real life, the life of the soul.

For my final word, let me add that I would welcome a little more narrowness in the matter of our Christian belief. Let me again protest that I loathe bigotry and intolerance. At the same time, without fixed and definite convictions we are useless and helpless. It is always according to our faith that it is done unto us—according, *i.e.*, to our positive belief.

For myself, I want to be as broad as the Apostles in the proclamation of a love that embraces the world. I want too to be as broad as they were in the frank acknowledgment that there may be diversity of ministration, but the same spirit. I want to be as broad as they were in the recognition that there may be varieties of Christian thought and experience—varieties illustrated in the New Testament itself by the differences in point of view between John and Paul and Apollos. But I want to be as narrow as they were in the proclamation of Jesus as the only begotten Son of God, the only Saviour and Redeemer of men. Incarnation and Resurrection—those are the two pivotal truths of the Christian faith. If we are not sure about them, we might as well close our doors, for we have no good news for this lost and stricken world. With our present fluidity of thought, we are like the river which spreads itself over a wide expanse of marsh and becomes slow and stagnant and powerless as a result. I should like to see a narrowing and deepening of conviction. I should like to see a greater concentration on our central and essential message. Then we should become like the stream which, because penned between narrow banks, becomes a source of energy and power. It is by the narrow gate of certitude and definite conviction that even the Church of Christ enters into life.[1]

---

## Quinquagesima.

### Mature Life.

By the Reverend T. Tudor Rhys, B.A., B.D., Hinckley.

'When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.'—1 Co 13[11].

There is no such thing as eternal youth. There is something far finer. There is the mature life. We all grow older: that is just a matter of time. But maturity is not something that comes to us, it is something to be fought for and won. The mature man is the man who has faced and fought a crisis. That is what Paul seems to be saying to us in this text. But he says more. He tells us what to do in the crisis. The general law has been put by C. G. Jung: 'Never carry into the afternoon of life the law of the morning.' Paul, however, goes into details. In the crisis comes the task of 'putting away' certain habits of mind, charming enough in early years, but fatal in manhood. What, then, are these 'childish ways' of which one must get rid in the crisis?

1. *Get Rid of Excuse-tokens.* The first of the three verbs used by Paul means 'I chatter.' What is this 'childish chatter,' so charming in children, so fatal in adults? One recalls the well-worn illustration: Little children keep continually on the go. They run about from morning till night with hardly a pause for rest or meals. How can they keep it up? Ask them, 'We do the work, father does the worrying.' That is the law of the morning. In one's younger days one is not responsible. If anything goes wrong there is always somebody else to take the responsibility and the blame. How delightful! Yes, but not from grown men and women. Yet one hears it: 'If my parents had not been so unreasonable! If my friend had not let me down! If my circumstances had been different! If the Church had done this, that, or the other!' Early disappointments tend to harden into excuse-tokens.

Grievances are real enough but what is to be done with them? There is only one thing. They must be 'put away.' They must be cleared out. And when disappointments are personalized, as they generally are, there must be a full and free forgiveness. That is the only way to weather the

[1] A Porritt, *J. D. Jones of Bournemouth*, 287.

storm of the crisis and to reach the mature life. There is only one person in the world who is responsible for my destiny and that person is myself. Nothing ever happens to me but there already exists a spark at least of that same thing in myself. Like attracts like. It is the lover who is loved. It is the betrayer who is betrayed. Or, as our Lord said: 'To him that hath shall be given'—either good or bad. One is oneself responsible. Accept that responsibility. And then, no sooner does a man accept that responsibility, painful though the process may be, than the open wound becomes a door through which the blessings flow. 'Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner.' And then what happened? 'He went down justified.' A grand word, that! There is sweetness and light in it. But there is also in it the bark and steel of the energies of God.

2. *Get Rid of Wishful Thinking.* The second word which Paul uses means 'I cherish a habit of thought.' In childhood thoughts are things. What a child imagines is real. He lives in a fairy-land, in a world of make-believe. For the little girl that bit of rag is a baby. For the little boy that bit of wood is a ship. In early life ideals are the real—with the difficulties left out. Indeed, when I was a boy, I used to drive a railway engine through charming country on a smooth track. But it was an engine whose wheels somebody else had oiled, and whose fires somebody else had stoked. In childhood you live in a world where you can get things, and even create things by wishing for them. That is to say, for nothing.

By the time one has reached middle life one should have learned that in this world there is no such thing as 'something for nothing.' Everything has its price. Yes, even the grace of God. Even salvation is too expensive for many because the price of it is repentance. In the crisis one should ask oneself: To what extent is my world a world of illusions?

There is the illusion, for instance, of overestimating oneself, of exaggerating one's possibilities, of underestimating the difficulties. As one grows older one should have found out what these illusions are and cancel them out. 'There are all my illusions facing me,' said Lafcadio Hearn, 'on faded yellow paper. I feel my face tingle as I study some of them.' One should try to face that crisis before the paper fades.

But there is the other illusion of underestimating oneself, of underrating one's possibilities, of magnifying the difficulties. The average man is apt to envy the man of genius because the latter has been given 'something for nothing.' Yet our Lord pointed out that the main difference between the ordinary man and the man of genius is that the latter is willing to pay the price. 'He went and traded with the same.' 'To scorn delights and live laborious days,' said Milton. 'His grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all,' said Paul himself.

In every man there gleams a spark of the divine fire, but all too often he is afraid of the labour and the hard work. And so he gets depressed and develops melancholia (like the man with the one talent) which is always the revolt of unused powers. But when a man finds out what he is really here for, goes 'all out' for it, and mobilizes all his forces, he finds he is helped by powers beyond human altogether. 'I can plod,' said William Carey—and then, 'Expect great things from God. Attempt great things for God.'

3. *Get Rid of False Reckonings.* Paul's third verb means 'I reckon,' 'I weigh up.' Reckoning up this life of ours, as an accountant might, we find that every person comes into this world with two tasks and for a double purpose.

The first task, and the obvious one, is biological. It is the task we share with all the other animals. It is the propagation of the species and the maintenance of the race. To fulfil that task one has to make a living and earn money. One becomes a cog in this world's machine and a pawn in this world's game. And that is fit and proper. 'Male and female created he them.' It is the allotted task. But it is only one of them.

The pity of it, and the tragedy of it, is that many carry the law of the morning into the afternoon and through the whole of life. They are the 'one task men' and nothing more. They live as though this world were the only world that counts. They go through life as though man were nothing but a biological biped. When such a man comes to the crisis he gets a bad time. He says: 'I am too old. I am not wanted. I have lost my grip.' Of course he has lost his grip. It is a significant fact that human beings outlive their biological usefulness. When the 'one task man' reaches the crisis and gets depressed he should remember that his very melancholia is the revolt of unused power. It is the 'Chief Engineer of the organism' who is trying to remind him that man has not one task but two, and that the second task is not the making of a living but the making of a life. 'And man became a living soul.' And if Nature's warnings go unheeded, sooner or later comes God Himself, 'taps a man on the shoulder' and says to him, 'Your soul is wanted.'

There is no such thing as eternal youth. There is something infinitely better. There is eternal life. The human soul is God-bent. Man is earmarked for immortality. And is it not here that we find the paradox resolved—'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God?'

# The Ministry of Mark.

By the Very Reverend R. O. P. Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Ringwood, Hants.

Barnabas and Paul 'had John (Mark) also to their minister' (Ac 13[5] A.V.). It has been customary to interpret Minister from a consideration of the possible personal needs of the Apostles. It is proposed here to fasten on the word Minister (ὑπηρέτης) itself and attempt to show that it gives a precise indication of the character of Mark's ministry.

The account of the incident is noteworthy, when taken as a whole. It is one of Luke's characteristic 'beginnings,'[1] indicating the whole of a subsequent state of things. The community sends out Barnabas and Paul as missionaries. Their work begins in the synagogues. At that cardinal point, Luke informs us that besides Barnabas and Paul, Mark was associated with them as Minister, εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην (note the δὲ καὶ). This, surely, points to some special function in connexion with the work among the synagogues.

This suggestion naturally leads to recollection of Luke's use of the word ὑπηρέτης in the account of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth (Lk 4[20]). In this place, the word is certainly a technical title, equivalent to the Jewish *Chazzan*. Indeed, according to Beyer (art. διάκονος in Kittel), Chazzan was translated into Greek always and only by ὑπηρέτης. The kind of function which the Chazzan discharged on that day at .Nazareth (the duty of a sort of chapel-clerk) was not one which Mark could discharge when Barnabas and Paul visited the synagogues of Salamis. These synagogues had their own Chazzans. But the Chazzan had duties outside the hours of divine service. He was the schoolmaster[2]—the person whose duty was to impart elementary education. And that education consisted in teaching the actual wording of the sacred records, the exact and precise statements of the facts and dicta on which their religion was based.

Seeing that Luke does not suggest that Mark spoke in the synagogues, this technical use of the word Minister indicates a sphere of usefulness for Mark. The business of Barnabas and Paul was to proclaim and argue. But when they had done their work and gained their point, the converts had to be instructed in the new set of facts. The Jew, especially, would want to know this addition to his religious history. And, being when he was, and what he was, he would expect to be taught it verbatim.

Teaching, as we have said, was teaching by rote.[3] It seems more than doubtful that, even among the Jews, the schoolmaster would have the sacred rolls in his hands as he taught. More probably he knew the prescribed lessons by heart. Similarly, the lack of a written Gospel would be no hindrance to a Christian teacher. In any case, the pupils had to learn all by heart. To ensure this, the Christian Minister of those early days would inevitably adhere to an unvarying form in his lessons, for otherwise his pupils could not possibly learn them by heart.

That is not to say that the Minister just drifted into a particular form of words. The traditional pattern of education would preclude that. The original selection and wording would originate from the Apostles, who must themselves soon have arrived at settled forms of instruction. There may, indeed, be an indication of this in Ac 6[4], where, after handing over other work to the Deacons, the Apostles say 'we will continue stedfastly in prayer, and *in the ministry of the word*. διακονία τοῦ λογοῦ.' This latter phrase is defined by Beyer (art. cit.) as equal to 'the service of the Torah' שִׁמּוּשָׁהּ שֶׁל תּוֹרָה, but, he says 'what goes with it is not propaganda but learning in the Halacha' (N.B. the *Oral* Law) 'through intercourse with the learned.' This certainly looks as though the Apostles were concerning themselves at that date with the teaching of a definite account of the Gospel history—a work which, once set in order, could be later handed over to subordinates.

In Mark's case there is no doubt as to the source from which he obtained his teaching, the person to whom he was subordinate. Papias, the earliest investigator of these matters, states, not only that Mark wrote down what he had got from Peter, but that Peter had already put the lessons into shape, ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας (note the plural). In addition, Papias tells us that what Mark wrote down was what he 'had in mind,' or 'produced from memory.' The word, which is here translated is ἀπεμνημόνευσεν, and it has been the custom

[1] Ac 1[1].

[2] See Edersheim, *Life and Times*, iii. 438, 443 (1907). Also A. R. S. Kennedy in art. 'Education' in *H.D.B.*, though he is inclined to distinguish the Chazzan of the school from the Chazzan of the Synagogue. This, however, would not weaken the present argument, but, rather, strengthen it.

[3] Even at a more advanced stage 'The method of study was *Mishna*, i.e. repetition, the lesson being repeated over and over until it was fixed in the memory' (David Smith, in *D.C.G.*).

to translate it as 'remembered.' But the word 'remembered' carries with it, in our minds, the context of our mental habits. In consequence, we are apt, implicitly, to distinguish it from 'learnt by heart.' The result is that we impute to Mark the kind of casual and sporadic memory which is characteristic of most of us. The correct implication of the word is that Mark had learnt by heart, and was in the habit of repeating exactly what Peter told. And Peter, if he ever varied his tale, even in early days, must soon have got each anecdote into set form. Here then, was the very kind of material which a ὑπηρέτης[1] required for his work.

This word ἀπεμνημόνευσεν needs further attention as it leads into a confirmation of this thesis. Justin, in explaining to outsiders the nature of the Gospel records which were read at the Christian services of his time, describes them by a noun belonging to this verb, calling them ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστολων. Moulton and Milligan, in the *Vocabulary*, illustrate the word which is underlined by a papyrus fragment of the third century —a later period even than Justin. The editors describe it as a fragment on rhetoric, and in adducing it say, 'ἡ χρεία, later defined as so called because it is χρειώδης—is defined as ἀπομνημόνευμα σύντομον ἐπι προσώπου τινὸς ἐπενετόν. The fragment proceeds διὰ τὶ ἀπομνημόνευμα ἡ χρια; ὅτι ἀπομνημονεύεται ἵνα λεχθῇ . . . . The note of the Memoir[2] accordingly is that it is *practical* (χρεια), concise (σύντομον), intended for oral delivery (ἵνα λεχθῇ) and relating to some person. All this suits excellently Justin's description of the Gospels as read in the Church meeting on Sunday morning.' So far the *Vocabulary*. And it seems fair to say that the illustration, which this fragment affords, goes to show that Justin's term implies that though the Gospels had been put into writing well before his time, they were still regarded as compositions meant to be remembered and spoken, if not repeated. And, being such, they were originally capable of being drawn up and imparted without being written.

The comment of the *Vocabulary* is given here as it stands, since it expresses an independent and authoritative judgment. At the same time, it must be pointed out that the fragment is really a definition of χρεία.[3] The writer was a rhetorician *i.e.* a student and teacher of literary forms. Now there was a well-known literary form known as χρεία, of which various examples survive. The singular of the noun is defined in the new Liddell and Scott as meaning 'a pregnant sentence frequently illustrated by an anecdote.' The plural stands for a collection of such. The purpose for which these were produced was to furnish persons, who joined in a Greek banquet, materials with which to follow up any lead in the conversation.[4] (Herein, it may be remarked in passing, lay its usefulness, not in its being what we would call 'practical.') The nearest English word, perhaps, is Ana, defined in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* as 'a collection of a person's memorable sayings,' though we have seen it used for other personal details. Now, as Papias was a well-educated man, living in Greek surroundings, it is worth considering whether this use of the word is not implied in his statement about the source of Mark's Gospel, that Peter πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας. May it not mean that Peter composed the lessons with a view to supplying Ana to be learnt and quoted ?

However that may be, we have Peter carefully drawing up a series of anecdotes which was learnt by Mark, and we have Mark being employed by Barnabas and Paul to teach a narrative, so composed. Nor are indications lacking that others were similarly employed. When Paul refuses to have Mark any more, he takes Silas in his place, while Barnabas still employs Mark. Evidently, both Paul and Barnabas required someone to do this work. Then there is to be considered the long association of Luke with Paul—at one time he was Paul's only companion. He may well have been, as tradition asserts, Paul's medical attendant. But that could not take up all his time. Seeing that the Third Gospel is undoubtedly his, and considering Paul's previous use of Mark and Silas, is it not reasonable to bring him into line with Mark as a ὑπηρέτης ? The gradual shaping of a Gospel under such circumstances and such auspices would account for a good deal.

Again, there are the Teachers (διδασκάλοι) who are ranked in Eph $4^{11}$ after the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, and the pastors—evidently a subordinate position. But the clearest reference to a definite class is afforded by Luke in the preface to his Gospel. He tells us that he consulted those whom he describes as ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.[5] It is clear that these were persons possessing exact and authoritative information. Since the official title used of Mark and the synagogue-minister is again used by Luke here, we may well conclude that, like Mark,

[1] I am not forgetting that Papias (or rather the 'Elder') in this fragment describes Mark as ἑρμηνευτὴς and not ὑπηρέτης Πετροῦ, but that raises other considerations which must be dealt with separately.

[2] The usual translation of Justin's word.

[3] Thus the second quotation means 'How is the Chreia a Memoir ? Because it is memorized in order to be spoken.'

[4] I owe the information in this sentence to the Rev. T. Nicklin.

[5] λόγος is here the Gospel. The insertion of γενόμενοι is surely significant.

these Ministers of the Word were the teachers and therefore the custodians of the accredited history.

Other reasons for postulating systematic oral instruction in the sayings and doings of Jesus, and for ascribing to that instruction, a high degree of fixity can be brought forward. But what has been adduced may, at least, help to give us confidence in the stability of that historical teaching which preceded the writing of Gospels. Moreover, enough has been said to indicate that the centre of that teaching was not only himself a real historical figure, but also a pupil and close associate of Peter, the apostle who played so prominent a part in the historical events. Since, therefore, we have so personal a guarantee of the veracity of the 'oral tradition,' we must allow that tradition to have a very different character from that which we, misled by the modern use of the word, are apt to ascribe to it.

# Contributions and Comments.

## On the supposed early death of John the Apostle.

THE import of two stories recounted by Clement of Alexandria and repeated by Eusebius appears to have been overlooked.

1. Eusebius ($2^9$) gives an account of the death of James—taken from Clement's *Hypotyposes*—in which 'the one who led James to the judgment-seat' was moved by the sight of James bearing his testimony to confess himself as a Christian. As a result, he and James were beheaded at the same time. There is no mention of John, although the subsequent imprisonment of Peter is recorded. Here we have a tradition that somebody was put to death with James which might have been the source from which the entry in the Syriac Martyrology commemorating the deaths of James and John on the same day may ultimately have been derived. Perhaps also the name of the anonymous martyr may have been John.

2. Clement's *Quis Dives Salvetur* contains another story also repeated by Eusebius ($3^{23}$) which has a bearing upon the date of the Apostle's death. It is that of the Apostle John and the Young Robber. In this story, which is supposed to take place after John had been on Patmos (and which Clement claims to be a true story and not a mere tale) John has returned to Ephesus and is 'aged.' Whether the subject matter of the story be true or not, it presupposes that (*a*) as Clement emphasizes its truth, he must have received it upon what he considered good authority and probably it had been in circulation for a long time, (*b*) that either Clement did not know, or did not credit, any tradition that John the Apostle had been put to death at the same time as James.

Taking into consideration Eusebius' knowledge of the writings of Papias, how came he to repeat either of these stories if he knew of any well-founded tradition (in Papias or elsewhere) that John had in fact been martyred on the same day as James and before the persecutions of either Nero or Domitian?

Another tradition which conflicts with the supposed early death of John is the story in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* $3^{3\text{-}4}$, of the meeting of John with Cerinthus in the baths at Ephesus. Even if it did not come to him from Polycarp, it must have been known for a generation before his time, and even if not true, it is difficult to account for the origin of the story if John and Cerinthus had not been contemporaries. If John had been put to death in 44 or 66, he would have died long before Cerinthus came into prominence.

K. F. EVANS-PROSSER.

*Norton Vicarage, Gloucester.*

# Entre Nous.

### Dr. J. D. Jones again.

Fifty years ago, or less, England was blessed with a company of great preachers, Spurgeon, Parker, Jowett, Liddon, and others. 'Jones of Bournemouth' was worth his place in this company. He was a big man, physically, morally, and spiritually, and for many years he was the outstanding personality in the Nonconformist religious world. Notice has already been taken in these columns of his autobiography, but it was fitting that his life and ministry should be described by another hand, and this has been done with insight and competence by Mr. Arthur Porritt in *J. D. Jones of Bournemouth* (Independent Press; 10s. net). The book contains chapters by Dr. Sidney M. Berry, Sir George Newman, Mr. E. H. Jeffs, Mr. J. E. Parry, Mr. J. Gurr Reed, Miss Gladys

Hayward, and Dean Lynn Harold Hough, as well as a selection of fourteen sermons.

Various sides of Dr. Jones' life are presented to us. He had a gift of friendship and among his friends were two Archbishops of Canterbury, two Bishops of Winchester and the present Bishop of Chichester. We like also to know a man's tastes. He read (of course !) thrillers, but he was nourished by Scott, Stevenson, and Trollope. Browning and Tennyson were his poets. But he was human enough to like a rubber of bridge and a round of golf. As to his politics, the spirit of Liberalism (with a capital 'L') was bred in his bones. He was a Gladstonian Liberal, a Free Trader, and a devoted adherent of the cause of liberty and equality. Perhaps the finest mental, or moral, quality in Dr. Jones was his tolerance which went far beyond what the orthodox practised. When the Rev. Frank Lenwood forsook the catholic belief about Christ, Dr. Jones, though himself an evangelical, would not support the clamour that broke out against him or the demand for his expulsion from the Congregational 'body.'

So much for his personal qualities. They may be summed up by saying that he was a good man. And to say that is to state his main demand on the Christian ministry. 'The one indispensable condition of our usefulness and success in the work of the ministry,' he said once publicly, 'is that we should be good men—men of pure and holy life—men of God. . . . We may be good ministers without being either learned or eloquent, but we cannot be good ministers without being good men.' It is a great deal to say of a man that he fulfilled that demand. But it is not too much to say of Dr. Jones. And his all-round excellence may be emphasized by the fact that he was, what all 'good' men often are not, wise with the wisdom of the serpent. His words quoted above about goodness ought to be laid upon the conscience of every young minister. But his example of broad human wisdom ought to be injected into their minds. He never thrust an innovation on his people. If they were inclined to reject it he waited until the prejudice faded away. When he went to Bournemouth his deacons objected to his wearing a Geneva preaching gown. He discarded it—for the time, but after a while the prejudice died and the gown was resumed ! In all matters, great and small, he made it a practice to postpone action till complete agreement had been secured. When his deacons were unanimous on any proposal, and only then, he allowed it to be brought before the Church meeting.

Contrary to a widespread belief, Dr. Jones held that we are fortunate in the period in which we live, because the atmosphere is so much warmer religiously than it was fifty or sixty years ago. Then, we had the arrogant atheism of a confident science. We had the aggressive secularism of Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant. We had secularist shops in every town and crowded meetings at which Christianity and the Bible were laughed at and decried as moribund. We had the first chilling impact of Darwinism and the Higher Criticism. To-day nearly all of that has passed away and our task is definitely easier than it was at that time. But in one way we are still the target of fierce criticism. To-day the attack is directed against the Church and we stand in sore need of men like Dr. Jones—men of broad humanity, of staunch faith and of dedicated goodness to meet the criticism by a spiritual *fait accompli*.

F. J. Rae.

*Edinburgh.*

---

**Heaven and Hell.**

'Lovers make their heaven out of small things: it is our hells, as a wise man has observed, that are so expansive.' [1]

---

**Why Work ?**

At Eastbourne in April last Miss Dorothy Sayers gave an address on the right attitude to work, a subject on which, she says, her friends feel she has a sort of obsession. The address, with the title *Why Work ?*, has been published by Messrs. Methuen (1s. net). Miss Sayers' plea is that work should be looked on not as a money-making activity, but as a way of life in which the nature of man finds its proper exercise and delight and so fulfils itself to the glory of God. To her mind it is on our attitude to work that the question of what is to happen to civilization after the war will turn.

Are we to go back to a period of wasteful consumption ? 'A society in which consumption has to be artificially stimulated in order to keep production going is a society founded on trash and waste, and such a society is a house built upon sand. . . . Sooner or later the moment will come when we have to make a decision about this. At the moment, we are not making it—don't let us flatter ourselves that we are. It is being made for us. And don't let us imagine that a war-time economy has stopped waste. It has not. It has only transferred it elsewhere. The glut and waste that used to clutter our own dustbins have been removed to the field of battle. That is where all the surplus consumption is going to.'

If we can alter our habit of thinking about work as something that must be done to make money this would mean, Miss Sayers says, 'taking the attitude of mind we reserve for our unpaid work—our hobbies, our leisure interests, the things we make and do for pleasure—and making *that* the standard of all our judgments about things and people. We should ask of an enterprise, not "will it pay ?" but, "is it good ?" of a man, not "what does he make ?" but "what is his work worth ?" of goods, not "can we induce people to buy them ?" but "are they useful things well made ?" of employment, not "how much a week ?" but "will it exercise my faculties to the utmost ?" And shareholders in—let us say—brewing companies, would astonish the directorate by arising at shareholders' meetings and demanding to know, not merely where the profits go or what dividends are to be paid, not even merely whether the

[1] A. Porritt, *J. D. Jones of Bournemouth*, 14.

workers' wages are sufficient and the conditions of labour satisfactory, but loudly, and with a proper sense of personal responsibility: What goes into the beer?'

If, then, the Christian understanding of work is that it is the natural exercise and function of man, it is the business of the Church to recognize that the secular vocation, as such, is sacred. 'The Church must concern herself, not only with such questions as the just price and proper working conditions: she must concern herself with seeing that the work itself is such as a human being can perform without degradation.'

A striking point made by Miss Sayers is that it is the worker's first duty to serve the work, not to serve the community. For her provocative criticism of the catch phrase of to-day that it is everybody's duty to serve the community readers are advised to turn to the address itself.

Miss Sayers sums up her whole argument in this way, 'Where we have become confused is in mixing up the *ends* to which our work is put with the *way* in which the work is done. The end of the work will be decided by our religious outlook: as we *are* so we *make*. It is the business of religion to make us Christian people, and then our work will naturally be turned to Christian ends, because our work is the expression of ourselves. But the *way* in which the work is done is governed by no sanction except the good of the work itself; and religion has no direct connexion with that, except to insist that the workman should be free to do his work well according to its own integrity. . . . Or perhaps we may put it more shortly still: If work is to find its right place in the world, it is the duty of the Church to see to it that the work serves God, and that the worker serves the work.'

---

### The Miracle-Loving Age.

Dr. E. L. Allen, who is Lecturer in Theology and Religious Knowledge in the University of Durham, has contributed a suggestive article to *The Christian World* (December 17th, 1942) on the credulity of to-day. He finds that 'what is so strange about our thinking to-day is that while we are certain that the physical universe is one of uniformity and regularity, we still imagine that the moral universe is one in which anything may happen, that one can commit folly and something is sure to happen to get one out of one's scrape.'

In contradiction to this Biblical writers may have gone in for 'pre-scientific thinking' so far as the natural world was concerned, 'but let it be said to the eternal credit of these men that they also had their faith in law and order: they held that this is a world in which no man can sin and his sin not find him out, that for a nation to trample on the rights of others is in the end to invite its own destruction.'

In proof of our credulity Dr. Allen instances how, 'in the critical months which preceded the present war, not a few of our Christian leaders staked not merely their own credit but that of the gospel on the assurance that there would be no war. God, they said, was too good to let that happen; He would intervene at the eleventh hour. Did they not remember the law that as men and nations sow, so also shall they reap? How could they hope that from the thorns of mistrust and suspicion it might be possible to pluck the grapes of good-will and peace? Did they not know—I speak now of Germany—that they who accept a tyrant over themselves must be prepared one day to see their neighbours in arms against them; or—I speak now of ourselves—that those who evade their responsibilities continually will one day have those responsibilities forced upon them in a tenfold more exacting form?'

'It was as I was turning over these thoughts in my mind that I was introduced to Peter Drucker's *The End of Economic Man*, to find in it the most powerful confirmation possible of this diagnosis. He describes how the morale of the German people broke down under the strain of defeat, inflation, and the instability of the Weimar Republic; the old securities had gone, and society was reeling back into chaos. In that state of utter despair, convinced that nothing could be done, they turned to Hitler, not as to a political leader with a programme in which they believed, but as to a witch-doctor, a man who could bring rabbits out of a hat. They knew that he was constantly contradicting himself, that he promised peace one day and glorified war the next; but that was precisely what made them shout themselves hoarse for him. Only magic and miracle could save them, and Hitler seemed to have both. It was a case of *Credo quia impossible*, or as Hitler himself put it, "The bigger the lie, the more likely it is to be believed".'

And now we give the illustration which Dr. Allen uses to point his thought. 'When Lorenzo de Medici lay dying, he sent for Savonarola. The friar came at his request. "Sire," he said, standing by the bedside of the agitated tyrant, "God is good, God is merciful; but for His forgiveness three things on your part are necessary." When Lorenzo asked what those were, he replied: "First, you must have a sure and lively faith in the mercy of God." "I have that." "Then you must restore all your ill-gotten wealth, or at least charge your sons to restore it in your name." The dying man made an effort and nodded his assent. Then Savonarola seemed to tower above him like an avenging angel as he came to his last point: "Finally, you must restore the liberties of Florence." Lorenzo's eyes flashed at him a look of fierce anger, then he turned his face to the wall and waited for death. Sooner hell than that!

'Was Savonarola perhaps too severe? Oh no! for he knew that God saves men, not by suspending His moral laws, but in strict accordance with them.'

---

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.